

1-2
24

* THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, *
* Princeton, N. J. 1-2 *
* 24 *
* ~~THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY~~ *

BV 710 .S991 1843 c.1
Smyth, Thomas, 1808-1873.
Ecclesiastical republicanism



ECCLESIASTICAL REPUBLICANISM;

OR THE

REPUBLICANISM, LIBERALITY, AND CATHOLICITY

OF

PRESBYTERY,

IN CONTRAST WITH

PRELACY AND POPERY.

BY THOMAS SMYTH,

AUTHOR OF LECTURES ON THE APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION; PRESBYTERY AND
NOT PRELACY THE SCRIPTURAL AND PRIMITIVE POLITY;
ECCLESIASTICAL CATECHISM, ETC.

PUBLISHED:

BOSTON, CROCKER AND BREWSTER; NEW YORK, ROBERT CARTER, JONATHAN
LEAVITT, AND WILEY AND PUTNAM; PHILADELPHIA, J. WHETHAM AND
SON, WILLIAM S. MARTIN, AND PERKINS AND PURVES; CINCINNATI,
WEED AND WILSON; PITTSBURGH, THOMAS CARTER; CHARLESTON,
S. HART, SEN., AND MC CARTER AND ALLEN;
LONDON, WILEY AND PUTNAM.

1843.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year One Thousand Eight Hundred and Forty-Three, by
CROCKER & BREWSTER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

S. N. DICKINSON, PRINTER,
No. 52 Washington Street.

TO THE
HONORABLE MITCHELL KING,

OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

THIS WORK,
IN VINDICATION OF THE CHURCH OF HIS FATHERS,

IS RESPECTFULLY AND AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED,

BY

THE AUTHOR.



P R E F A C E .

THE following work may require some explanation and some apology. The author has been for some years engaged in a careful examination of the subject of church government, especially in reference to the claims of prelacy to an exclusive possession of the rights, privileges, and immunities of the church of Christ. He was thus led to publish his ‘Lectures on the Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession, or the Protestant Ministry Defended against the Exclusive Assumptions of Popery and High-Churchism,’ in 1841. This work he followed up, according to his original design, by his recent volume, just issued from the press, ‘Presbytery and not Prelacy the Scriptural and Primitive Polity, proved from the Testimonies of Scripture; the Fathers; the Schoolmen; the Reformers; and the English and Oriental Churches. Also, the Antiquity of Presbytery; including an Account of the Ancient Culdees, and of St. Patrick.’ In pursuing the investigations necessary to complete these works, the

author was led to discover the determined claim, preferred by the prelatie and Romish churches, to a greater conformity, in spirit and in order, to our republican institutions than any other denominations, as well as to a greater liberality, and an exclusive catholicity. He was therefore induced to comprehend in the plan of the above work, a discussion of these questions, and to examine into the comparative adaptation of the different ecclesiastical systems to the system of our republican government, and their relative claims to the character of true liberality and catholicity. The following chapters were therefore embodied as a part of the third book of the above work, where they are found in the analysis of it, which was published in the Charleston Observer. It was discovered, however, that this work was sufficiently extensive without these chapters, and as they were not necessary to the unity of the argument, the author was induced, by the advice of judicious friends, to publish them in a separate form.

Such, then, is the nature and design of the present volume, and such the apology which the author offers, for again presenting himself before the public. The subjects embraced in it are believed to be deeply important to the civil and religious interests of this country. They commend themselves to every patriot as matters of great practical and present concern, which must, ere long, *demand* the earnest consideration of every reflecting mind. They are not

theoretical speculations. They contain principles which lie at the foundation of human conduct, and which come 'home to the business and bosoms of men.' There are those who think otherwise, and who consider the great questions which divide religious denominations as mere logomachies. Any alleged connection between the systems of ecclesiastical and civil government they regard as a mere visionary dream, concluding, that because politically distinct and separate, their moral and intellectual relations are equally independent. To such minds, the author presents the considerations offered in the following work, and asks for them a candid and impartial hearing.

Greatly would he rejoice could he have moderated the views which he is constrained to take of the dangerous character and tendencies of popery, and its kindred system, high-churchism. Tender associations bind him to many individuals in both these sects. Among them may be found many, distinguished by every quality that can give personal distinction, and attract the love and admiration of all who know them. It is, therefore, truly painful to the author, to be impelled as he is, by an irresistible call of duty, to utter his free thoughts concerning the religious systems to which such men are attached. Every day's experience and research, however, only confirm and strengthen the convictions formed by education. But it is with *the systems*, and not with *their abettors*, the author is at

war. To their own master *these* stand or fall, and by Him alone are they to be judged. While contending, therefore, earnestly for the truth, he would desire to cultivate towards all men that charity 'which is the bond of perfectness, and which hopeth all things.'

He will only add, that he uses the term presbytery in its generic sense, as equally applicable to all non-episcopal churches, and that the great portion of the present volume will be found based on those generic principles, by which they are all distinguished from prelatic churches. Such being his general design, the author will be borne with, in those illustrations which are drawn from his own denomination, and those arguments which are presented in vindication of its character.

CHARLESTON, S. C., 1843.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER FIRST.

THE PRINCIPLES OF REPUBLICANISM EXPLAINED, AND SHOWN TO EXIST IN THE JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

	Page
<i>Sec. I.</i> Preliminary remarks,	13
II. The principles of republicanism,	23
III. The principles of republicanism found in the Jewish Church,	31
IV. The principles of republicanism fully developed in the Christian Church,	35

CHAPTER SECOND.

PRESBYTERY REPUBLICAN BOTH IN ITS DOCTRINAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL SYSTEMS.

<i>Sec. I.</i> What denominations are included under the term Presbytery, in the present argument,	52
II. Presbytery republican in its doctrines,	54
III. The framers of our ecclesiastical system designed that it should neither be a monarchy, nor a democracy, but a republic,	61
IV. All the principles of republicanism are found in our Presbyterian system,	65
V. Presbytery is republican in its doctrine of the ministry,	67
VI. Presbytery is republican in its doctrine of ordination. Objections answered,	73

	Page
VII. Presbytery eminently republican in its office of ruling elders. Objections answered,	75
VIII. Presbytery eminently republican, also, in its various ecclesiastical judicatories,	79
IX. Presbytery republican in several other particulars, with testimonies in its favor,	85
X. Presbytery republican in its creeds; in its protection of minorities; in the framing of its laws; in its universal suffrage; and in its simplicity and opposition to all unnecessary forms,	88
XI. Presbytery eminently republican in having originated and secured in this country, the separation of religion from politics, and of the Church from the State,	94

CHAPTER THIRD.

THE REPUBLICANISM OF PRESBYTERY ATTESTED BY HISTORY.

Sec. I.	104
II. The form of government among the Waldenses, who have always been thorough Presbyterians, was as purely republican,	105
III. The republicanism of Presbytery fully developed by the reformation,	108
IV. The republicanism of Presbytery illustrated from its history in modern times in England,	127
V. The republicanism of Presbytery demonstrated from its history in these United States,	138

CHAPTER FOURTH.

PRESBYTERY MORE REPUBLICAN THAN OTHER FORMS OF CHRISTIAN POLITY.

Sec. I. The system of Presbytery more republican than the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, . . .	148
II. Presbytery more republican than the Protestant Episcopal Church,	153
III. The anti-republicanism of High-Churchism, . . .	172
IV. The anti-republican character of Popery, . . .	181

CHAPTER FIFTH.

THE LIBERALITY OF PRESBYTERY.

	Page
<i>Sec. I.</i> True liberality, as distinguished from bigotry and latitudinarianism, explained,	202
II. The liberality of the Presbyterian Church, in her general principles as to the nature of the Christian Church,	215
III. The liberality of the Presbyterian Church, in her doctrine of the sacraments,	224
IV. The liberality of the Presbyterian Church, in her doctrine of ordination,	227
V. The objection founded upon the persecuting principles and conduct of Presbyterians, answered,	231
VI. The Presbyterian Church is at once liberal and orthodox,	239
VII. Testimonies in proof of the liberality of Presbytery, .	242
VIII. The illiberal character of Romish and Anglican Prelacy,	254

CHAPTER SIXTH.

THE CATHOLICITY OF PRESBYTERY.

<i>Sec. I.</i> The catholicity of Presbytery in its ecclesiastical system, in contrast with Popery and Prelacy, .	271
II. The catholicity of Presbytery, in its doctrinal system, in contrast with Popery and Prelacy,	287

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

THE SECURITY, SAFETY, AND EFFICIENCY OF PRESBYTERY, .	295
CONCLUSION,	303
APPENDIX,	309
NOTES,	317
INDEX,	319



ECCLESIASTICAL REPUBLICANISM.

CHAPTER I.

THE PRINCIPLES OF REPUBLICANISM EXPLAINED, AND SHOWN
TO EXIST IN THE JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

SECTION I.

Preliminary remarks.

THE subject to which the attention of our readers is invited, is the republicanism of those ecclesiastical systems, which come under the denomination of PRESBYTERY, as opposed to PRELACY. All denominations who agree in holding to one order of ministers are properly *presbyterian*, and are, therefore, included under the term *presbytery*. And the question before us, is, whether there is any connection between ecclesiastical and civil governments, so as that the former, according to their nature, will exert a corresponding influence upon the latter; and if they do, whether the forms of ecclesiastical government, included under the term *presbytery*, are more congenial to republicanism, and promotive of it, than either prelacy or popery.

In entering upon this discussion, we wish it to be most explicitly understood, that we do not identify christianity, or the christian church, with any form of civil government. On the contrary, it is one of the fundamental principles of presbyterian faith, that the kingdom of Christ while *in* this world is not *of* it, but is entirely sepa-

rate and distinct in its nature, objects, subjects, and end. The church is a society of a select and sacred nature, which stands in intimate relation to Christ, from whom it receives special and continual direction, superintendence, and grace; having its existence by the will of Christ, its Head; having a power of self-government, inherent in it by divine right; and being thus authorized to form regularly constituted societies for spiritual purposes, to meet in churches and ecclesiastical courts, to celebrate ordinances, to admit to these spiritual privileges on terms prescribed by Christ, or to exclude from them such as violate these terms; and, generally, to govern and direct the affairs of the christian societies, for the glory of God, and the edification of the household of faith. It will be thus seen, that, on our interpretation of the scriptures, christianity is entirely independent of civil government, and different from it in its ministry, in its motives, in its instrumentality, in its practice, in its teaching, in its officers, in its laws, in its authority, and in its sanctions. It has to do with the men of the world, merely that it may best prepare them for the world which is to come; while, in all things that regard this present life, and the civil rights and temporal interests of men, it leaves them to be guided and controlled by that civil government, which may be established over them, or by them. True christianity is the only religion which draws a proper distinction between the things of God, and the things of Cæsar, earnestly inculcating submission to civil authority in all lawful respects, and that not from inferior but the highest motives. It gives far more sacred and exalted views of civil government, than any other religion. It represents it not as the contrivance of human wisdom, but as the ordinance of Heaven; to be obeyed not from the fear of punishment, but for the sake of conscience. 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' 'Render unto *all*

their due: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.' 'Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake.' 'You must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake.' &c. Never, says Whateley, was the christian required to do less than to conform to such principles; never will he be called on to do more.

On this subject, the teaching of our church is as beautiful as it is scriptural.* 'God, the supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under him, over the people for his own glory, and the public good; and to this end, hath armed them with the power of the sword, for the defence and encouragement of them that are good, and for the punishment of evil doers. It is the duty of the people to pray for magistrates, to honor their persons, to pay them tribute and other dues, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority, for conscience sake. Infidelity, or indifference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him; from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted; much less hath the pope any power or jurisdiction over them in their dominions, or over any of their people; and, least of all, to deprive them of their dominions or lives, if he shall judge them to be heretics, or upon any pretence whatsoever.'

It follows, therefore, that christianity may and does coexist with *any* form of civil government, and that christians may be loyal citizens of such a government, and conscientiously uphold and promote its interests, whether

* Nowhere has the distinction between the civil and ecclesiastical power been better explained than in Conf. of Faith, ch. xxiii. of the Civil Magistrate, in the Second Book of Discipline of the Scotch Church, and in the celebrated cxi. Propositions concerning the Ministry and Govt. of the Ch. presented to the Genl. Assembly, and printed, Edinb. 1647, 4to.

it be a monarchy, an aristocracy, or a republic, so far forth as it does not conflict with their duties to God.* We do not, therefore, teach, that because presbyterianism, as an ecclesiastical system, is republican in its character, and most perfectly harmonizes with republican institutions, that presbyterians are less faithful, loyal, or true, as subjects of any other form of civil government, than are the members of any other church.

It is no part of our intention to authenticate, as of divine right, the republican form of civil government, or to allege that this form *alone* can characterize the ecclesiastical government of a true church. On the contrary, while we believe human government to be an ordinance of God, its particular character is, we think, left to the determination of human reason, under the control of whatever light God has given it in his word and providence. And in conformity with this arrangement, the ecclesiastical government of the church has been so moulded by its divine head, as to be capable of administration under every mode of government, from the absolutism of a despotic monarchy, to the untrammelled liberty of democratic freedom.

We do not, therefore, design to cast any shadow of dark imputation upon the character of church members in other countries and ages, and under other governments than our own happy republic; nor to bring their loyalty and true-hearted allegiance into question. As it regards the presbyterians of Britain, there never have existed a more loyal and devoted race of subjects, nor one more patriotic and true to the best interests of their country.†

* See on this point Christ. Indep. of Civil Govt.; Brooke's Hist. of Relig. Lib. vol. i. pp. 4, 6; Lectures on the Headship of Christ, Glasg. 1840. &c. &c.

† The confessions of faith of all protestant churches, which were drawn up not by moderates but by evangelical men, teach the same. Accordingly, christians, who have been reviled as rebels, have uniformly proved the most enlightened friends of loyalty, and have been most useful in seasons of national danger. The christians of apos-

But assuming that the republican form of civil government, as it exists in this country, is best adapted to secure the greatest amount of personal liberty, social enjoyment, and political prosperity; and that it most fully embodies and exhibits the spirit of liberty; our inquiry shall be, whether, and how far, the presbyterian form of church polity is analogous to our civil constitution; whether the genius of presbytery and of republicanism are found to be in strict alliance; and whether, in this respect, our form of ecclesiastical polity does not eminently commend itself to the admiration and regard of every American citizen, to *whatever* religious denomination he may belong. It will be our object, therefore, to make it appear, that the platform of the Bible, while limited to principles so general as to accommodate it to any order of civil institutions, is yet pregnant with the spirit of liberty; and, when allowed its full development, illustriously displays its essential affinity to whatever is most promotive of human happiness and the liberty of mankind; and that the presbyterian form of ecclesiastical polity most readily adjusts itself to republicanism, and is free from any thing which might justly excite jealousy, distrust, or apprehen-

tolie and primitive times were distinguished for their loyalty. Proofs to the same effect might be quoted from the history of the protestant churches of France, and Piedmont, and America. Louis XIV. repeatedly testified to the loyalty of his protestant and evangelical subjects, declaring that they had given proof 'of their fidelity and zeal for his service beyond all that can be imagined, and contributed in all things to the welfare and advantage of his affairs.' The Duke of Savoy himself gladly acknowledged the loyalty of the Vaudois as quite remarkable. The eminent loyalty and fidelity of presbyterians in contrast with the disloyalty of prelates, has been demonstrated from the facts of English and Irish history, by almost all the old writers. See Prynne's *Antipathy of the English Lordly Prelacy both to Regal Monarchy and Civil Unity*, &c. Lond. 1641, 2 vols. 4to. Milton's *Reason of Ch. Govt.* in *Works*, vol. i. p. 29, &c. Lord Brooke on *Episcopacy*, ch. vii. and ix. p. 38. Jameson's *Fundamentals of the Hierarchy*, part i. § 2, pp. 5 and 17. Baxter on *Episcopacy*. Calamy's *Defence*. Pierce's *Defence*, &c. &c. See also Lorimer's *Manual of Presbytery*, ch. v. p. 207, &c. Campbell's *Vindication of the Principles and Character of Presbyt. Ch. in Ireland*. Lond. 1787, third ed. and *Plea for Presbytery*.

sion on the part of the governing authorities of the land, or of a justly watchful people.

Neither is it any part of our design to criminate other denominations, or to hold up what is distinctively called the presbyterian church, as the only one that is analogous to that form of republican government under which we live, much less to imply that others are hostile to 'the powers that be.' On the contrary, we rejoice in believing, that, to a great extent, there is a harmony of spirit and of order between the ecclesiastical system of our various christian denominations, and those of the civil commonwealth, and that the members of all desire to emulate the highest attainments in patriotic devotion to the interests of our country. But in the strength of this analogy, as exhibited in different churches, we believe there is a great diversity, some being more republicanized than others. The degree of approximation to a republic, found in the numerous leading forms of ecclesiastical polity, we shall have occasion to point out; and while we believe that any form of church government will consist with any form of civil government, which does not, by any of its principles, interfere with the authority of that government in civil matters,* fidelity will require us to point out the dangerous character of popery, which binds all its members in subjection to a foreign potentate, and to a despotic hierarchy.

To such a comparison we are urged by the zeal with which all denominations are pressing their claims to a republican character, upon the attention of a people, to whom such a recommendation justly gives a most hearty welcome. 'We have repeatedly,' says the New England Puritan, 'recorded our conviction, that congregationalism is not only more in harmony with the teachings of the New Testament than any other system of eccle-

* Brooke on Episcop. pp. 39, 40, 47.

siastical polity, but also more purely *democratic* than any other. We, of course, use the term 'democratic' in its original signification, and not as descriptive of the tenets of any political party.' Similar, and as exclusive claims are made, by the baptist denominations. The unitarians, who are also congregationalists, make their devotion to the interests of civil liberty a fundamental article in their popular creed. The protestant methodist church has separated from the episcopal body on this very ground, that it was in its polity anti-republican, and opposed to the just rights of a large portion of the clergy, and the whole of the laity.* The methodist episcopal church, however, is not bashful in proclaiming 'the republicanism of methodist polity.'† The episcopal church is also heard proclaiming aloud her merits as the most purely republican of all republics.‡ Nay, even the Romish church, not satisfied with her infallibility, and other unapproachable excellences, sets all her rivals at defiance, by the assertion, that her system 'is *most* favorable to equality of conditions.'§

It is, therefore, a time for presbyterians to speak, and not be silent. We say, '*audi alteram partem.*' We also would give our reasons for the hope that is in us, that, when weighed in the balances against all others, we shall

*See Questions and Answers explanatory of the Government of this Church. Charleston, 1837. The History and Mystery of Methodist Episcopacy, by Alexander M'Carne. Balt. 1827. Also his Defence, &c. Balt. 1829.

† See recent articles in the Christ. Advoc. and Journal, and several also in the Southern Christian Advocate.

‡ Bishop White, in his Memoirs of the Episcopal Church in this country, declares, 'that episcopacy, as now settled in America, must be confessed at least as analogous as presbytery — the author thinks more so — to the plan of civil government which mature deliberation has established over the union.' Mem. of Prot. Ep. Ch. p. 55. But perhaps bishop White was not the best judge of such an analogy, since he openly states, that 'in consequence of an impartial comparison,' he prefers the laws and the manners of the British nation to those of any other. Ibid, p. 57. See also the Comprehensive Church, by Rev. Thomas H. Vail, Hartford, 1841.

§ Tocqueville's Democracy in America, vol. i. pp. 328, 329 and 332.

not be found wanting. And what we speak, we speak as unto wise men, judge ye what we say.

Neither is any one justified in supposing, that this is a useless question, or one which leads to no practical results. We believe and affirm the contrary. As well might it be said that the forms of civil government have no practical influence upon the manners, morals, and habits of a people, as that different ecclesiastical systems will not exercise a similar influence. 'Every religion,' says Tocqueville,* 'is to be found in juxtaposition to a political opinion, which is connected with it by affinity. If the human mind be left to follow its own bent, it will regulate the temporal and spiritual institutions of society upon one uniform principle, and man will endeavor, if I may use the expression, to harmonize the state in which he lives upon earth with the state he believes to await him in heaven.'

'Who,' asks Dr. McCrie,† 'that has duly reflected on the subject, can be ignorant that forms of government exert a mighty influence, both directly and indirectly, on the manners, and habits, and sentiments of the people who live under them; and that some of these forms are unspeakably preferable to others? That they are better adapted to impose a check on ambitious or corrupt rulers — prevent or correct the abuses of maladministration — provide for the impartial distribution of justice — preserve the spirit and perpetuate the enjoyment of liberty — promote education, virtue, and religion; and, in fine, to secure to the people at large all that happiness which it is the original and proper design of government to procure and bestow. These remarks apply with greater force to ecclesiastical than to political government. The advance-

* Ibid, p. 328. See also p. 334. See this also illustrated in 'Foreign Conspiracy against the Liberties of the United States,' p. 34, and note B.

† Life of Melville, vol. ii. p. 470.

ment of the interests of religion, the preservation of purity, of faith and morals, the regular dispensing of religious instruction and of all divine ordinances, and, in general, the promoting of the spiritual improvement and salvation of the people, have always depended, and must always depend, in a high degree, on the form of government established in a church, and on the rules by which discipline is exercised in it.'

It is on these grounds we attach importance to the present inquiry. God forbid, that we should pursue it with any sinister or political ends. But the ecclesiastical system of the presbyterian church, we conscientiously believe to be eminently adapted to advance these glorious objects. Although it takes no direct part in the government of society, it must nevertheless be regarded as the foremost of the political institutions of this country; for if it does not impart a taste for freedom, it facilitates the use of free institutions.* To it Scotland has been indebted for other blessings besides the efficient support of the gospel, of a collateral kind, and of the highest importance. To it she owes that system of education which has extended its blessings to the lowest class in the community. To it she owes the intelligence, sobriety, and religious principle which distinguish her commonality from those of other countries. To it she owed a simple, unambitious, laborious, and at the same time independent order of ministers. And to it she was indebted for that public spirit which has resisted manifold disadvantages in her political and religious institutions; disadvantages, which otherwise must have reduced her to a state of slavery, and made her the instrument of enslaving the nation with which she became allied by the union of the crowns.†

We have only one other preliminary observation to

* Tocqueville, i. 334.

† Life of Melville, ii. 471.

offer. When we affirm that presbyterianism, as the form of ecclesiastical government prescribed in the New Testament, is republican, we contemplate the church in its mundane or visible administration. We inquire not from whom is the authority to govern derived, but to whom on earth is this authority delegated. Considered in reference to its totality, and to Christ its head, the government of the church is an absolute monarchy. Christ is head over all things to the church; and hence, is it one and universal, under Him as its Sovereign.* The question, therefore, now before us, does not affect the church, in itself considered—in its complete development—in its universal extent—and in its relation to heaven as well as to earth. In this view, as are republics themselves, it is a theocracy, a divine spiritual monarchy, of which Christ alone is Head, Lawgiver, and King. But the question is, what is the character of that delegated government, intrusted by the King of Zion to his ministers and people here on earth? what is the character of that administration under which the visible church is placed, in this sphere or province of Christ's dominion, and in subordination to his celestial royalty? The relation between the ruling part and the ruled, in any community, constitutes the character of its government. Viewed, therefore, as subject to Christ, the christian church is a monarchy, just as the Jewish was in its relation to God. But, considered as governed by the laws of Christ, and the representative officers authorized by Him, it is, as we shall endeavor to prove, just like the Hebrew commonwealth, a republic.†

* Ephes. 4: 15; 1: 22; Col. 1: 18; 2: 19; Eph. 5: 23; Col. 3: 15; Rom. 12: 4, 5; 1 Cor. 10: 17; Eph. 2: 16.

† This is an old and useful distinction. In 'Syon's Royal Prerogative,' Amsterd. 1642, p. 31, we find, that Peter Martyr, in his common places, making the church a monarchy, in respect of Christ, an aristocracy in respect of the elders; addeth, also, that because there are matters of great weight and importance referred unto the

SECTION II.

The principles of republicanism.

All forms of government are reducible to five; the despotic, the monarchical, the aristocratic, the republican, and the democratic. A despotic government is that in which a single person directs every thing by his own will. A monarchy is that in which a single person governs by fixed and established laws. An aristocracy is formed when the supreme power is vested in the hands of a small number of the people, who constitute a nobility. A republic is that government in which *the people*, under certain restrictions, are possessed of the supreme power; and a democracy is that in which the supreme power is possessed and exercised by the whole body of the people.*

Montesquieu includes under the name of republic, the aristocratic, the republican, and the democratic forms of government.†

The term republic includes, according to Brougham, aristocracies, in distinction from oligarchies; aristocracy being the government of the best or highest classes, that is, of those who are intrusted with authority, because deemed best qualified to use it.‡ But this cannot refer to a permanent or hereditary aristocracy, which is composed of a certain number of citizens stationed above the mass, than which nothing can be more contrary to nature, and the secret propensities of the human heart.§

The clearest definition, however, is that given by our own Webster. He says a republic is a commonwealth;

people, as excommunication, absolution, choosing of ministers, and the like; it hath also a consideration of a popular government. Of the same judgment was Junius.

* See Montesquieu's *Spirit of Laws*, b. ii. chap. 1.

† Ibid, chap. ii.

‡ Polit. Phil. p. 73.

§ Tocqueville, i. 456.

a state in which the exercise of the sovereign power is lodged in representatives elected by the people. In modern usage, it differs from a democracy, or democratic state, in which the people exercise the powers of sovereignty in person.'

The government of the United States, is not, therefore, a democracy,* but a republic, in which the people exercise the supreme power; not *directly*, but by means of a president, a senate, and a house of representatives, who are all elective, and a judiciary body. The supreme power resides *ultimately* in the people, but it is exercised *immediately* by representatives chosen by the people, responsible to them, and limited in their official acts by the constitution. The government of the United States is, therefore, a pure republic, but it is not a democracy, since the people do not conduct its administration as in the ancient democracies, by meeting together *en masse*. *Practically*, it is a republican aristocracy, the government being conducted by a part of the people, elevated by themselves to the temporary dignity of office, and returning, when their term of office expires, to the common rank of ordinary citizens. It may, therefore, be as truly denominated an aristocracy, as a democracy. It is, in truth, neither. It is a compound of both—a new creation—a mixed government, combining the advantages of all others. But it least resembles a *pure* democracy, which, after all, is an Utopian dream, never yet realized, either in Greece or Rome, or in any modern republic.† Such a government, we may safely say, could not exist.‡ It

* Tocqueville evidently uses democracy as synonymous with republic; but in defining terms they must be distinguished.

† Brougham's Polit. Phil. pp. 92, 93. 'Neither our state or confederate governments, can,' says the Hon. John Quincy Adams, 'without a gross and fraudulent perversion of language, be denominated a democracy.' Lect. at Providence, Nov. 1842, in Eddy's Christian Citizen, p. 14.

‡ Tocqueville, i. 157, 159–162, 165. Locke on Govt. ch. vii. § 89 and 94.

was only while they practically carried out the principles of representation and delegated power, the ancient republics of Greece and Rome prospered. In all cases when the democracy, which is *mobocracy*, was triumphant, anarchy, bloodshed, civil war, defeat, and ruin, were the disastrous consequences.* Regular government was no longer regarded as a benefit, but as an evil, to be endured only up to that point which the majority, goaded on by the demagogue, believed to be necessary. A multitude not reduced to unity, by delegated power, is confusion, and invariably leads to that unity which is independent of the multitude, that is, to despotism.† But great as is this latter evil, it is not so desperate as the other, since there is no tyranny so capricious, lawless, and cruel, as that of the mob. Nor can any one read the history of its doings in ancient times without devoutly praying, from such a government, good Lord, deliver us.§ In the state of freedom, that is, in a republic, man is governed by the laws to which he has given his consent, either in person, or by his representatives; but in a pure democracy, he is governed by the unrestrained will of others.§ With republic on their tongues, the members of a *pure* democracy are despotical in practice, and approve their character to be, ‘that fierce democracy.’

That system of government is best, which secures the most perfect laws, the most beneficial administration of the laws made, and the most advantageous use of the resources of society for the great purposes of government and defence, and the promotion of the happiness of the

* See this illustrated in Dr. Bisset’s interesting work, ‘Sketch of Democracy,’ Lond. 1796. He does not, however, distinguish between democracy and republic. Also Dr. Vaughan’s Congregationalism, Lond. 1842, p. 45, &c. Absolute equality led to all the horrors of the Anabaptists and of the Jacobins in France. Villers on Ref. p. 113. See also Locke on Govt. ch. vii. § 89, Wks. vol. ii. pp. 251, § 94.

† Pascal’s Thoughts, Art. cxiv. p. 288.

‡ See its evils depicted by Tocqueville, i. 251, 256.

§ See the Hamilton Papers, vol. i. p. 12.

whole community. But a republic does all this, since it gives security against abuse, against internal shocks, and against foreign aggression, by making the resources of society easily available.*

What, then, are the essential principles of our republican form of government? In reply, we remark, that there are some principles essential to the system, and by which it is characterized, which may be called the primary, or fundamental laws of republicanism. Other principles, again, are equally essential, though not peculiar to it, more than to any other well ordered community; which may be termed the secondary laws of republicanism. Among these, may be mentioned virtue, by which, as Montesquieu says, it is supported, education, intelligence, sobriety, and public spirit.

Among the primary or fundamental laws, which characterize our American republic, may be named the following.

The equality of conditions, is, according to De Tocqueville, the fundamental principle from which all our other institutions flow.† By this is to be understood: 1. That all are by birth equally eligible to any office, for which they are deemed fit. 2. That the laws are made equally by all, acting through their representatives. 3. That none are elevated to any station in which they can act, or legislate, independently of the people.‡ 4. That no artificial obstacles exist in the way of a man's becoming the richest, or most learned in the state, every man being at liberty—with no other impediments, than such as the common obstacles of human nature, and the equal rights of his neighbor, impose—to strive after wealth, honor, and happiness. And, 5. That no hereditary ranks are recognised,

* Brougham's *Polit. Phil.* p. 60.

† Tocqueville, i. *Introd.* p. 1. Algernon Sydney's *Disc. on Govt.* ch. 1, § 2, and ch. 2, § 31. Fol. Lond. 1751, third ed.

‡ *Ibid*, p. 7.

so that any honor conferred on any man, by any office given by the people, though it elevates his rank, and may reflect honor on his posterity, cannot descend to them. Responsibility to the people, is, therefore, a fundamental principle of republicanism; a responsibility which gives the most insignificant contributor of his money towards any object, a right to examine into the manner in which it is disbursed.*

The power of the people, claimed by them as derived from the laws of nature, and not as the gift of any earthly power, is, therefore, a foundation principle of republicanism.† ‘While those bodies are in existence, to whom the people have delegated the powers of legislation, they alone possess, and may exercise those powers. But, when they are dissolved, by the lopping off of one or more of their branches, the power reverts to the people, who may use it to an unlimited extent, either assembling together in person, sending deputies, or in any other way they may think proper.’

The right and duty of private judgment, liberty of conscience, liberty of opinion, and liberty of the press, are also among those fundamental maxims upon which all republicanism is, and must be, founded; and without which, it is a political heresy, and cannot possibly be carried on.‡

It follows from these principles, that in our republic, every man is left to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience; that the church is separated from the state; that all religions are equally protected by

* The great rule of all free institutions, *that the people alone shall lay taxes* — a vital principle of all constitutional government — an essential guaranty of all safe public administration — has become involved, is at stake; that solemn canon of republican creeds — that high fundamental law — no, sir, not a law, the mere part of a code, or a constitution; it is itself a constitution; for, give but that, and a real constitution must follow; take it away, and there is an end of all practical freedom. Mr. Archer’s Speech in Congress, Aug. 1, 1842. See Locke on Govt. ch. vii. § 94. Wks. vol. ii. p. 254.

† Jefferson’s Wks. vol. i. p. 113, 115. ‘The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time,’ p. 116.

‡ Tocqueville, i. 453, 466, and ii. 23, &c.

the state, while none are patronized; and that toleration is, therefore, a doctrine indignantly rejected, as implying a power to sit in judgment upon religious creeds, and practically to endure what is theoretically condemned.*

It is, further, the very essence of republican government, that it lies ultimately, and absolutely, in the majority.† Not that the minority are subject to their will, or that any majority remains, for any time, the same; the constitution throwing its ægis around the minority, and time changing it altogether.‡

It is also a fundamental principle of our free government, that every man, of what quality or condition soever, ought to be equally subject to the laws, and either obey them, or suffer the penalties ordained for the transgressors.§

The extension of the right of suffrage as far as possible, that is, as far as will consist with a due regard to

* See Christ. Indep. of the Civil Govt. pp. 148–150. Upon this rock is built the fabric of religious liberty.

† Tocqueville, i. p. 275.

‡ Mr. Preston followed, in an animated reply to Mr. Clay, opposing entirely his doctrine as to the veto power. The proposed abolition or modification of that power would, he argued, be an infraction of the compromises of the constitution. He disputed Mr. Clay's position, that this was a government of *majorities* alone. It was so framed as to protect minorities. Neither the house nor the senate represented majorities; the former represented local interests, and the latter was rather of an aristocratic character. The president alone represented majorities. He was the immediate representative of the people — of the majority of the people — having no regard whatever to national interests. He was allowed to have no national spirit — no spirit adverse to that of the body of the people, whom he represented. The object of the veto power, was, to protect this popular majority in their rights, as opposed to the local interests, or party interests, of congress.

There was less danger from the executive, than any other department in the government; if there was any danger, it was, that it might become *too democratic*. There was no fear of its being aristocratic. Twelve vetoes had been exerted — two by Washington, four by Madison, one by Monroe, five by Jackson; and each veto was popular, and increased the strength of the executive. It was, after all, merely a conservative power — in force only for a short time, till the people could form and express their own opinions in the matter. Speech in the senate.

§ See this frequently enforced by Locke on Government.

the rights of property, and to the necessary qualification for citizenship; in short, the rights, privileges, and immunities of the laity, if we may so speak, in contradistinction to all in authority; — this is a keystone in the republican arch.*

Trial by jury is also, and for the same reasons, an eminently republican element in government; *provided*, however, the jurors are selected *from* and *by* the people.† Blackstone calls an ‘aristocracy the most oppressive of absolute governments,’ and he affirms that every new tribunal erected for the decision of facts, without the intervention of a jury, is a step toward establishing it.‡

Simplicity, and an opposition to all unnecessary forms and external observances, is another principle of republicanism. Nothing is more repugnant to it than a subjection to forms; — nothing more distasteful than ceremonial

* ‘Suffrage,’ says a writer in the Charleston Courier, ‘ought to be as general as it can be possibly made, without injury to society, and without defeating its own ends, and the very rights it was intended to secure. Universal suffrage is not now recognised in practice, by our general, or any of our state governments. Existing restrictions, extend throughout all of them to non-residents, females, minors, paupers, and privates, and non-commissioned officers in the army of the United States; in many of them to slaves and free persons of color; in nearly all of them to unnaturalized foreigners; and in several, a property, or tax, or registry qualification is required. The problem of suffrage is one of difficult solution; but it demands the attention of the American statesman. It should certainly be extended, if possible, to every citizen, whether rich or poor, who is worthy to exercise it; but some mode should be devised, to exclude those from this high privilege of republicanism, who basely barter it for gold, and thus corruptly hold up the high offices of the land to the highest bidder; and we should not be deterred from adopting some efficient general rule, promotive of the purity of elections, although it should work individual hardship in a few instances. Universality of suffrage only mocks the people with the shadow of power, and really confers the substance on the wealthy aristocrat, or the artful demagogue. The best friends of republican government, and American freedom, are those who would devise some means of so regulating the right of suffrage, as would purge it of its impurities, and disorders, and secure political ascendancy to the *unbought* voice of the people.’ *Universal suffrage* did not prevail even in the ancient democracies. Kent’s Commentaries, vol. i. p. 232.

† Tocqueville, i. pp. 308–311, 314.

‡ Comment. b. iii. vol. ii. p. 295.

observances.* ‘ One of the plainest doctrines of American republicanism is, that mere glory-giving titles, or titles of servility, are entirely opposed to its whole spirit. They are considered as one of those artificial means of king-craft, by which it fosters that aristocratic, unholy pride in the human heart, which loves to domineer over its fellow man, which loves artificial distinction of ranks, a privileged class, and, of course, which helps to sustain that whole system of regal and papal usurpation which has so long cursed mankind.’

Our federal government is clothed with all the powers necessary to represent, and carry out, the interests of each state, and the conduct of those affairs which cannot be administered by the states separately, inasmuch as they regard the united interests of all ; and also to preserve peace among the various states.

Our federal government is also empowered to act *directly* on the people, in carrying out the powers, and securing the objects, intrusted to it. So also are the states respectively, in their several spheres, and within the limits mentioned.

The judiciary is appointed to pass upon any action of any member of the confederacy, which seems to be contrary to the laws of the union.

In short, Tocqueville reduces the principles which most powerfully conduce to mould the character of our republic, to these three.† ‘ The first is, that federal form of government which the Americans have adopted, and which enables the union to combine the power of a great empire with the security of a small state. The second consists in those municipal institutions which limit the despotism of the majority, and at the same time impart a taste for freedom, and a knowledge of the art of being

* Tocqueville, vol. ii. pp. 3, 25, 26.

† Vol. i. p. 327.

free, to the people.* The third is to be met with in the constitution of the judicial power. I have shown in what manner the courts of justice serve to repress the excesses of democracy; and how they check and direct the impulses of the majority, without stopping its activity.'

SECTION III.

The principles of republicanism found in the Jewish church.

IN its complete form, as embracing the invisible as well as the visible church, the Jewish form of government was a theocracy, or divine monarchy. God, for special ends, connected with the glorious scheme of redemption, condescended to be elected king of the Hebrews, to give them a code of civil laws, to decide their more important litigations, and to solve inquiries which they proposed. But while the constitution of the Hebrew polity was, in its complete form, theocratical and monarchical; in its relation to men, and the character of its earthly administration, it was necessary that it should assume a distinct and separate character. The patriarchal form of government, which, until this time, had generally prevailed, with few exceptions, throughout the east, may be regarded as republican, the patriarch acting as perpetual president, with his officers under him, as is the case among the Arabs and the various tribes of Indians, at this very hour.† Such also was the character of the most primitive kingdoms and the most ancient kings. 'In the most remote antiquity,' says Jahn,‡ 'aristocracies and democracies were well known. The inhabitants of

* Ibid, vol. i. pp. 28-35, 85.

† Algernon Sydney's Disc. on Govt. ch. i. § 7, Lond. 1751, 3d ed.

‡ Hist. of Heb. Commonwealth, p. 59. See also Sydney's Disc. on Govt. ch. ii. § 8, 10, 16 and 18.

Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjathjearim, had neither king nor prince. The national council and the people commissioned ambassadors and concluded alliances. The Philistines were governed by five princes. The Phenicians were not, at all times, under regal government, and when monarchy existed, the power of the king was very much limited. The Carthaginians, who emigrated from Phenicia, and probably formed their government on the model of that of the mother country, from the first introduced an aristocracy, in many respects similar to the old Venitian oligarchy. If the story of Herodotus (III. 80, 81,) be true, the great Persian monarchy, after the death of the impostor Smerdis, came very near being transformed to a democracy.* The ancient states of Gaul also, from whence the Britons were probably derived, were aristocratic republics. In these it was customary to elect a prince or chief governor annually; and a general was likewise appointed by the multitude to take command in war. Alliances between the different tribes was also a very prominent feature in their mode of government. A government of the same description had, before Cæsar's time, extended itself in Britain.*

The Hebrew magistrates,† who were very jealous of their prerogatives, managed the political concerns of the nation; and their powers were so extensive, that Josephus chooses to denominate the government an aristocracy. Moses laid all the precepts and orders, which he received from Jehovah, before the magistrates, acknowledged their authority in the strongest terms, and submitted their demands to the decision of Jehovah. But these magistrates could neither enact laws on their own authority, nor levy taxes. The people possessed so

* Pritchard's *Researches into Nat. Hist. of Man*, vol. iii. pp. 175, 177.

† Jahn, *ibid*, pp. 59, 60, and *Archæology*, § 219, p. 261, &c.

much influence, that it was necessary, in all important cases, to have their approbation; and when they were not consulted, they often remonstrated so loudly, as to force the magistrates to listen to them. They also sometimes proposed laws, to be adopted by their legislatures; and they had power sufficient to rescue Jonathan, when his life was endangered in consequence of the hasty vow of their first monarch. It is evident, therefore, that the aristocracy was greatly modified and limited by the intermingling of democracy. On this account, Lowman and Michaelis are inclined to denominate the Mosaic constitution a democracy.

‘The truth,’ says Jahn,* ‘seems to be between these two opinions. The Hebrew government, putting out of view its theocratical features, was of a mixed form, in some respects approaching to a democracy, in others assuming more of an aristocratical character,’—that is, it was, as we have defined it, a republic. The affairs of this national church were conducted by a regular series of gradually ascending assemblies, representing the families, the tribes, and the whole twelve tribes. These were composed of the princes, or heads of tribes, and of persons expressly denominated ‘those called to the assembly, those deputed to the assembly, and the elders of the assembly.’† These are called by Jahn, ‘comitia, or legislative assemblies.’ These legislative assemblies exercised all the rights of sovereignty. They declared war, made peace, formed alliances, chose generals, chief judges or regents, and kings. They prescribed to the rulers, whom they elected, the principles by which they were to govern; they tendered to them the oath of office, and rendered them homage.

* Archæology, p. 262. Algernon Sydney's Disc. on Govt. ch. ii. § 9. Locke on Govt. B. i. ch. xi. § 168, 169. See also Lamy's Apparatus Biblicus, B. i. ch. xi. p. 195, &c.

† Jahn's Heb. Com. pp. 48 and 56. Archæology, § 218. Michaelis's Com. on Laws of Moses, art. 45, vol. i. p. 229.

The number of these who were intrusted with power as judges, genealogists, heads of families, princes of tribes, and kings, or supreme judges, and who were all representatives of the people, and elected by them, was immense. There were, even at first, about sixty thousand judges of tens, twelve thousand judges of fifties, six thousand judges of hundreds, and six hundred judges of thousands.* Every tribe had, therefore, its own chief magistrate, with the subordinate rulers, and was, in itself, a distinct and independent republic, which often acted as such, not only when there was neither king nor judge, but even in the times of the kings.† ‘The constitution of Israel may, in this respect,’ says Michaelis,‡ ‘be considered, as in some measure, resembling that of Switzerland, where thirteen cantons, of which each has a government of its own, and exercises the right of war, are all united into one great republic. All the twelve tribes had, at least, one commonweal. They had general diets, of which, we find examples in the twenty-third and twenty-fourth chapters of Joshua. They were bound, at least, by law and compact, to take the field against a common enemy; and the tribe of Ephraim, as mentioned above, took it as a serious injury, that, without waiting for their assistance, the tribes beyond the Jordan had gone to war with the Ammonites. They frequently had general judges, and afterwards general sovereigns. And, even in times when they had no common head, any particular tribe that refused the administration of justice, might be accused before the other tribes, who were authorized to carry on war against it as a punishment. Of this, we find a remarkable instance in the twentieth chapter of Judges.§

* See Jahn’s Heb. Com. pp. 45–47.

† Michaelis’s Com. on Laws of Moses, vol. i. p. 234.

‡ Ibid, pp. 235, 236.

§ See also, on this subject, Dr. Spring’s Obligations of the World to the Bible, p. 109, &c. N. Y. 1839.

SECTION IV.

The principles of republicanism fully developed in the christian church.

THIS view of the republican character of the Hebrew polity, which might be enlarged by a reference to the synagogues, already brought under review,* will prepare us for considering the republicanism of the christian church. This, like the Jewish church, is in its complete form, a theocracy, Christ being King and Head of Zion; but, unlike that, it is not of this world, having no reference to civil or political concerns, as matters of jurisdiction, but being exclusively conversant with spiritual things. Being, however, founded on earth; having for its subjects living men; and its affairs being, therefore, necessarily administered by human agents, the church, as visible, must have some visible form, constitution, and polity.

The original constitution of the christian church was, it has been said, a supreme theocracy, with a subordinate democracy, modified by an elective aristocracy.† The head of the whole body was the Lord Jesus Christ. The democracy was found in the christian laity, the members of the church; and the aristocracy in those officers who were elected by them to rule over them in the Lord, and to administer His ordinances and statutes. ‘But in process of time the theocracy was greatly neglected, the democracy oppressed and almost annihilated by the aristocracy; and the aristocracy itself converted, first into an ambitious oligarchy, and lastly into a tyrannical despotism.’‡

That the christian church was originally republican, in contrast with monarchy on the one hand, and democracy

* See the Author's work, ‘Presbytery and not Prelacy the Scriptural and Primitive Polity.’ B. i. ch. xiii. § 3.

† See Eccl. Chron. by Rev. J. Riddle, p. 13.

‡ Ibid, p. 14.

on the other, has been generally acknowledged.* This republican character continued till the time of Constantine, and is thus described by a philosophical Romanist, in a work issued as a prize essay, by the National Institute of France.† ‘While the apostles lived, they were naturally the heads of the communities or churches of which they were the institutors. After their death, the last pastor was replaced by his principal disciple. Several of these churches sometimes agreed with each other, and formed a sort of confederation, which appointed a common head, a visiter, episcopus, or bishop: afterwards they separated to subsist alone, or to unite with others. In general, they kept voluntarily within the limits of a province, præfecture, or diocese of the Roman empire. Each christian, however, was a disciple, an active member of the church or confederation to which he belonged. The pastors were the spiritual magistrates of them, republican magistrates, whose decision, in matters of belief, was only valid, because they were believed to be wiser or better informed.‡

* See Father Paul's *History of Benefices*, p. 52, &c. Neander's *Hist. of the First Planting of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 165, N. and p. 42. Waddington's *Church Hist.* pp. 23, 24, Eng. Ed. Baxter's *Disput. on Ch. Govt.* p. 267. Allsop's *Melius Inquirendum*, p. 235. Lord Brooke on *Episcopacy*, pp. 80–83. That it has been generally treated of under this name, appears from the names of some among many works. Palmer on the *Ch.* vol. i. p. 329. Bishop White's *Mem. of Prot. Ep. Ch.* p. 76. Dominis Mark Antony *De Archbishop of Spalato in Dalmatia. De Rep. Ecclesiast. libri x.* Lond. 1617, 3 vols. Andreas John Valentine, a Lutheran, *Reipubl. Christiano-politanæ Descriptio. Sancta Maria Juan de Repub. Polit. Church Par.* 1631, 4to. Fixlaniilmer Placidus, a German, *Reipubl. Sacræ Origines Divinæ*, 1760. Milman's *Hist. of Christ.* vol. ii. p. 65. Hoppus on *Schism*, p. 219.

† Villers on the *Reformation*, p. 308.

‡ ‘The situation of the churches,’ says Neander, (*Hist. of the Chr. Ch.* vol. i. p. 195. See also 196, 197, and 198,) ‘during the persecutions, and the numerous oppressions, in which the energetic conduct of one man at the head of affairs might prove of great use, furthered the formation of the monarchical government in the church. And yet, even in the third century, the presbyters were at the side of the bishops, as a college of councillors, and the bishops undertook nothing weighty without gathering together this council.’

From the time of Constantine, A. D. 325, to Mahomet, A. D. 604, the church was governed by an oligarchy. And yet even, of this period, the same writer says, ‘the bishops and patriarchs still compose an oligarchy, in which none submits legally to the authority of a single one. Laymen and priests still preserve their rights, and patriarchs bow to the authority of a council, diet, or parliament of this church republic.’*

From the period last named, until the time of Hildebrand, A. D. 1073, the authority of the Roman See became predominant in the west, both in spiritual and temporal matters, and the government of the church monarchical.† From that time until the reformation, the authority of the Roman See was unlimited, the popes were regarded as the representatives of God, and the earth as their domain; and the government of the church, therefore, was an unlimited spiritual despotism.‡

‘The acts of papal omnipotence,’ adds this Romish author, ‘during its course, were the humiliation, urged to excess, of all christian princes and people; rebels supported and encouraged every where, against the legitimate authority, when that of the pope was in opposition to it; sovereigns dispossessed and excommunicated, as well as their subjects; crowns taken away, given, sold, according to the interests or passions of the pontiff; the bishops and clergy of all the catholic countries subjected to his will, receiving from him the investiture of their charges, and holding them almost exclusively of him; so that the hierarchy every where formed a state within a state, under the dominion of a foreign despotic chief, who, by its means, disposed of all the consciences, and of nearly all the riches of a country. The means employed by the court of Rome, to support so many usurpations, were, besides the fictitious

* Villers on the Reformation, p. 315.

† Ibid, p. 323, &c.

‡ Ibid, p. 334.

historical proofs, which imposed on the ignorance of these times, effrontery, perseverance, uniformity of design, which were always superior to the weakness and disunion of their opponents; the celibacy of the clergy; auricular confession; the establishment of the mendicant orders and that of the inquisition; the crusades, undertaken by the christian princes, under the authority of the church; the immense sums which all the countries of the west poured into the pontifical treasury, under different names, tithes, Peter's pence, taxes, dispensations, &c.; the indulgences and jubilees; the doctrine of purgatory, which they employed as a support; that of transubstantiation; the worship of saints, of relics, and miraculous images, pilgrimages; in fine, every thing which is capable of transferring religion to the senses of mankind, and consequently, of nourishing and exciting fanaticism, by depriving the mind of all right to examine and to weigh.'

It must be allowed, that in the New Testament we nowhere meet with the terms monarchical, aristocratical, or republican, nevertheless the republican character of the christian church may be seen, by looking at its doctrines, its spirit, and its institutions.

The doctrines of christianity breathe the spirit of republicanism. All the opposite forms of government are founded upon four great sophisms, which were long received as axiomatic truths; first, that the noble, the rich, and the great, are, by nature and divine right, superior to their fellow men; secondly, that the other classes of society were designed to be in absolute subjection to the guidance of the great; thirdly, that passive obedience is the sum of all civil virtue; and fourthly, that true dignity and glory are found only in elevated rank, in power, in wealth, and in conquest.* Now these sophisms Christ

* See a very able work, by 'Brutus,' Foreign Conspiracy against the United States, p. 160.

completely and everlastingly destroyed, by passing by these elevated conditions of humanity, which he might have assumed ; by being born of humble parents, and in a lowly condition ; and by identifying himself through his whole life, with the people, and setting at nought all the pride, pomp, and circumstance of nobility and power.* The whole tenor of his instructions conveyed the same lessons to mankind. He taught that his kingdom was not of this world, and, therefore, that while it was a monarchy, it was so only in relation to himself, as its invisible and eternal king. He retained all headship to himself, so that He is now, as much as when on earth, head over all things to his church. All power is given unto him, and resides in him, so that nothing is available on earth but what he ratifies in heaven. Christ, therefore, is the only source of all spiritual power ; the only lawgiver of his church ; the only supreme executive and judicial head. In erecting his church, he environed it with a written constitution. About her he has traced a circle, like that of the exorcist, with words of such tremendous power, that even the gates of hell cannot overstep it. 'For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book ; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book.'

Christians are, therefore, to be in bondage to no man. They are to call no man master upon earth, seeing that one is their master, even Christ. The germ of the entire system of equality, as now developed in the theory of

* It is therefore recorded, that 'the common people heard him gladly.' 'The cultivated heathen,' says Tholuck, 'were offended at christianity, precisely for this reason, that the higher classes could no longer have precedence of the common people.'

republicanism, is contained in the system of the gospel. For, since Christ has for ever accomplished all that was prefigured by the priesthood and sacrifices of the Old Testament, and all that is necessary to secure the everlasting salvation of mankind, it follows that all who by faith believe upon him, appropriate to themselves this salvation, stand in no need of any other mediation, human or super-human, are equally related to Christ and to God, are equally members of the christian commonwealth, are in God's sight, and in their spiritual birthright and privileges, altogether equal. This system precludes for ever the possibility of those distinctions which are found in all other forms of religion, between a priestly caste, who are by divine right superior, and a plebeian caste, of whom these priests are the necessary governors, mediators, and directors.* On these grounds even the apostles always put themselves on an equality with their brethren, and asked an interest in their common prayers, and instead of tutoring the people to a condition of pupilage, dependence and vassalage, encouraged them to feel that they were all, equally with them, kings and priests unto God;† and placed in this very spirit, that liberty by which they were so eminently distinguished above both Jews and Gentiles.*

Christ therefore established the first idea of a universal religion, a fraternity of all men under the authority of a common head, a confederation of all in the one universal republic — his church.‡ How did Christ break down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile, crush the narrow jealousies, and proudly assumed superiority of the former over the latter, and acknowledge the Gentiles as members of God's kingdom, with equal privileges.

* Epistle to Galatians, &c.

† Rev. 12: 1, and 1 Peter, 2: 9.

‡ Villers on the Ref. p. 303. See this idea beautifully developed by Reinhard, in his Plan of the Founder of Christianity.

How constantly does Paul contend for the independence of christianity, upon all the forms and hierarchical notions of less enlightened brethren. In all his epistles, we find noble protests against the Judaizing spirit of intolerance, and in favor of the freedom of the Gentile christian churches. The consciousness of divine life, received from Christ, thus necessarily led to the recognition of a communion embracing all mankind, a unity which counterbalanced all the other differences existing among mankind and which reconciled the most marked contrarieties, arising either from religion, national peculiarities, or mental culture. 'For ye are all the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.'*

Christ also abjured all employment of force or compulsion, in the propagation or preservation of the gospel. He rebuked the disciples, who would have called down fire from heaven to consume their adversaries; telling them that they knew not what spirit they were, (or should be,) of, as Christians. He rebuked Peter when he drew his sword against the high priest's servants, assuring him that they who draw the sword, shall perish by the sword. When he could have summoned to his rescue 'more than twelve legions of angels,' he meekly submitted to the power of his enemies; and when all authority was given to him in heaven and on earth, he sent forth his disciples, not to subjugate or coerce, but to TEACH all nations whatsoever he had commanded them. In short, as the Abbé de la Menais familiarly and frequently says, Christ was, if we may reverently speak it, the great republican of his age.†

Neither is any thing more frequently and forcibly inculcated in the New Testament, than the right and duty of

* Neander's Plant. of Chr. Ch. ii. 165.

† See in Dr. Spring's Oblig. of the World to the Bible, p. 115.

private judgment. It addresses its hearers as 'reasonable men.' It 'commends the truth to every man's conscience in the sight of God.' It calls upon all that have ears, to hear; upon all that hear to search the scriptures whether the things heard are so; to prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good. And it requires every man to be fully persuaded in his own mind, and thus to be able to give a reason of the hope that is in him, to every one that asketh it.

Equally opposed is the whole tenor of the gospel to all formalism and to that ritual kind of worship, from which it was a deliverance. It is eminently simple, spiritual, and rational. And while it necessarily accommodates itself, in some measure, to the weakness of man, in the employment of outward rites and external worship, it warns every man that 'the letter killeth, the spirit giveth life;' and that 'circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision, (or baptism,) is nothing, but a new creature.' Paul declares, that 'Christ sent him not to baptize, (or to administer sacraments and frame liturgies, and prescribe fasts and saint's days,) but to preach the gospel.' 'Let no man, therefore,' says the inspired apostle, 'judge or condemn you, in regard to the use of meat or drink, which they choose to interdict, or for not observing the festivals and holy days they choose to establish. These things, as established under the former economy, were only a shadow of good things to come, but Christ and his gospel are the body, and contain all things necessary to be either believed or practiced. Wherefore if ye, by belief in Christ, are freed from any necessity for trusting in these worldly and carnal ordinances, why do ye still, as if bound by them, subject yourselves to such human institutions, which are only enforced by the commandments and doctrines of depraved and superstitious men.*'

* Col. 2.

Such are some of the principles of the gospel. And well do they entitle it to be called ‘the glorious liberty of the children of God.’ Instead of weakening our attachment to the principles of liberty, it augments it a hundred fold, by that spirit of noble independence it inspires; by the magnitude of those religious privileges it confers; and by the ardor and tenacity with which it leads us to cling to them. It is irreconcilable with spiritual despotism. It leads not only to perfect equality, but to perfect freedom. It proclaims to every man liberty of conscience, free from the doctrines and impositions of men, guided and restrained only by that ‘law of liberty,’ whose service is perfect freedom.*

And if, now, we turn from the principles and spirit, to the institutions of Christ, we will find them equally harmonious with the genius of republicanism. Christ instituted a church—and what is the church? It is the whole number of Christ’s faithful people. It includes every true believer, whether high or low, rich or poor, learned or unlearned. To these he gave his commission. To these he bequeathed his promises. To these he delegated the administration of his laws, the proclamation of his gospel, and the propagation of his cause; and these, wherever they are found, are members of the church of Christ. The first christian community constituted, as it were, one family. It was based upon the recognition of a full and perfect equality, in all its members, neither sacrificing the individual to the community, nor the community to the individual. Every christian was then a priest and a king unto God, and had a full participation, either personally, or through others delegated by him, in all the acts of government, and discipline, and in the appointment of officers.† All the mem-

* See Symington’s *Dominion of Christ*, p. 210, and Chalmers’s *Wks.* vol. vi. pp. 179, 180.

† Neander’s *Plant. of the Chr. Ch.* vol. i. pp. 37, 41, 42. See also Claude’s *Def. of the Ref.* part iv. ch. iii. p. 233, vol. ii.

bers of the community took part in its government, and each had an equal right to do so. As none were different from their fellows, none could exercise tyrannical power. They were perfectly free, because entirely equal, and they were all entirely equal, because perfectly free.*

Christ instituted a ministry and officers for his church—and who are these? Any aristocratic body? No. Any spiritual nobility? No. Any close corporation of self-exalted dignitaries, who might perpetuate, in hereditary succession, their ‘plenitude of episcopal power and grace?’ No. Any vassal throng of eunuch celibates or monks, the body-guard of Him who sitteth in the temple of God, as the vicar of Christ, and calling himself God? Oh no. They are those whom he calls by his grace and Spirit. They are those whom he makes willing by his power. They are those whom his faithful people elect and choose to minister to them in holy things.† They are taken from among the people. They are those who are tried in all points as the people; who sustain all the cares, and discharge all the duties, devolving on the people; and who are thus touched with a feeling of all their people’s infirmities. They are educated by the people. Their gifts are tried by the people. They are called to their work by the people,‡ and they are sustained in their labors by the free-

* Tocqueville, ii. 99.

† See Claude, *Ibid.*

‡ ‘So far as regards elections to these offices,’ says Neander, (*Hist. of the Chr. Ch* vol. i. pp. 191, 192,) ‘we are without sufficient information to decide certainly, how it was managed in the first apostolic times, and it is very possible, that from a difference in circumstances, the same method of proceeding was not adopted in all cases. As the apostles, on the appointment of the deacons, allowed the church itself to choose; and as this also was the case, when deputies were sent by the churches, in their name, to accompany the apostles, (2 Cor. 8: 19,) we may conclude that a similar proceeding was resorted to in the appointment to other church offices.’

Of a later period he speaks, at pp. 203, 204, ‘In regard to the election into church offices, the old principle was nevertheless constantly abided by, that the consent of the church was required, to ratify such an election, and that every one was at liberty to bring forward objections

will contributions of the people. They are, therefore, the servants of the people. They exist for the people, and not the people for them. They are the shepherds of the flock.

Christ instituted two, and only two sacraments, and these are open alike to the rich and to the poor, to the bond and to the free, to the male and to the female.

Christ instituted church courts for the decision of controversies, either in cases of conscience, or in point of manners, for the admission or exclusion of members from the body. Now in each and all of these, the people sat, not *en masse*, but by their chosen representatives or delegates. The very first christian convention held at Jerusalem, was a meeting of chosen delegates, and the first controversy respected the liberties of the church.* 'If we rightly consider apostolic example, councils are nothing but general presbyteries,'† representing the interests of many churches, just as particular presbyteries watched over the affairs of individual churches. In these sat the apostles, when alive and present, the presbyters, and the brethren who were chosen to such office by the people. These officers, or christian magistrates, were elective by the people of each particular church. They were also numerous, constituting a college or senate. In every

against it. The Emperor Alexander Severus was aware of this regulation of the Christian Church, and he appealed to it, when he wished to introduce a similar course in the election of the civil magistrates in towns. When Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, separated from his church, by calamitous circumstances, named men of his neighborhood who had particularly distinguished themselves in the persecution, he apologized for this arbitrary conduct, which had been wrung from him by necessity, before the laity and the clergy, and he writes to both: 'We are accustomed to call you together to consult previously to the consecration to spiritual offices, and to weigh the character and merits of all in a general consultation.' That principle was also recognised in the appointment to the episcopal office, it was the prevailing custom in the third century.

* Neander's Hist. of the Planting of Ch. Chr. vol. i. pp. 136, 147. See also Lord Brooke, on Episcop. pp. 80-83.

† Milton's Works, vol. i. p. 106.

assembly or senate, the laity had their representatives. Finally, these officers were not thrust upon the people by any appointment exterior to themselves, but were chosen by their own free and unrestrained votes, from the general body.*

The form of government in each christian church was not monarchical, since the supreme power was not lodged in the hands of any one individual. ‘The monarchical principle,’ says Neander,† ‘in spiritual things accords ill with the spirit of christianity,’ &c., which constantly points to the feelings of mutual need, and the necessity and blessing of common deliberation, as well as of common prayer. Where two or three are gathered together in the name of the Lord, there, also, he promises will he be among them. In addition to this, it was the custom of christianity, to appropriate to its own use existing forms, when it found any which suited its spirit and its essence. Now there was actually a form of government existing in the Jewish synagogues, and in all the sects which had their origin in Judaism; and this was in no respect a monarchical, but an aristocratical, that is, republican form; a council of the elderly men, *πρεσβυτεροι*, which conducted all common affairs. It was most natural for christianity, developing itself from out of Judaism, to embrace this form. This form must also, wherever churches were established in the Roman empire, among the heathen, have appeared the most natural; for men were here accustomed, from of old, to see the affairs of the town carried on by a senate, the assembly of *decuriones*. That the comparison of ecclesiastical administration with the political, really took place here, is shown by this, that the spiritual persons were afterwards named an *ordo*, the leading senate of the church, for *ordo* was a word pecu-

* See Neander's *Planting of Chr. Ch.* i. pp. 165–181.

† *Hist. of the Chr. Ch. and Rel.* i. 186, 187. See also 193.

liarily appropriated to this rank of senators, *ordo senatorum*. In compliance with this form, a council of elders was generally appointed, to conduct the affairs of the churches; but it was not necessary that it should be strictly composed of those who were the most aged, although age was taken very much into the account; but age was rather considered here as a sign of dignity, as in the latin *senatus*, or in the Greek *γερονσια*. Besides the usual appellation of these governors of the churches, namely, presbyters, there were many others also in use, designating their peculiar sphere of action, as shepherds, and one of these appellations was also bishops, denoting their office, as leaders and overseers over the whole of the church.'

Neither was the form of the apostolical church government democratical, since the power was exercised, not by the people, in mass, but through their appointed officers, except on such occasions, when it became necessary for the people to resume their authority, and to elect new officers. The government of the primitive church was therefore republican, that is, the sovereign power resided in the christian people, constituting each community; the supremacy of the people was acknowledged; the equality of rights and powers in every member of the church preserved; submission to laws emanating from them, or at least avouched by them, alone, required; while all officers were elected by the people, were amenable to them, held office over them at their will, and received compensation to perform services for their spiritual benefit. 'As to what further regards the relation of these presbyters to the churches,' says Neander,* 'they were destined to be, not unlimited monarchs, but rulers and guides in an ecclesiastical republic, and to conduct every thing in conjunction with the church assembled together, as the servants, and not the masters of which, they were to act.' So that while the *exercise* of power was in the

* History of the Christian Church, vol. i. p. 193.

officers, that is, the ministers and representatives of the people, the source of that authority, as delegated by Christ, and as bounded by his immutable and written laws, was in the people.

‘Each individual church,’ adds Mosheim, in his Commentaries,* ‘assumed to itself the form and rights of a little distinct republic or commonwealth; and with regard to its internal concerns was wholly regulated by a code of laws, that, if they did not originate with, had, at least, received the sanction of the people constituting such church. This primitive liberty and independence, however, was by degrees relinquished, and it became the practice for all the minor churches within a province, to form themselves into one large association, and to hold, at stated seasons, much after the manner of *confederate republics*, a *convention*, in which the common interests and welfare of the whole were taken into consideration, and provided for. Of the immediate authors of this arrangement we are uninformed, but it is certain that it had its origin in Greece; and there are many things which combine to prove, that, during this century, it did not extend itself beyond the confines of Asia. In process of time, however, the very great advantages attending on a federation of this sort, becoming apparent, other provinces were induced to follow the example of Greece, and by degrees this form of government became general throughout the whole church; so that the christian community may be said, thenceforward, to have resembled one large commonwealth, made up, like those of Holland and Switzerland, of many minor republics. These conventions or assemblies, in which the delegates from various associated churches, consulted on what was requisite to be done for the common welfare of the whole, were termed *synods*, by the Greeks, and by thy Latins, *councils*. To the laws

* Comment. on the Affairs of Christ. vol. ii. p. 99, 100.

enacted by these deputies, under the powers with which they were invested by their respective churches, the Greeks gave the name of *canons*, or general rules, and by this title it also became usual for them to be distinguished by the Latins.'

These common councils, synods, and general assemblies, were first regularly established among the Greeks, a country which had been accustomed to a federal system, and to the use of public assemblies in matters of legislation and jurisprudence. We have records preserved of such christian assemblies, as early as A. D. 160–173.* It was impossible they should have been formed much earlier, since the churches and presbyteries were comparatively few, far apart, and prevented, by external opposition and jealous resistance, from making any visible display of their union or their strength. From the very first, however, they held intercourse and exchanged views; granted letters of intercommunion; and, by a certain common law, governed the whole body.† These more general associations were, therefore, the spontaneous and necessary development of the principles of christianity — the christian, catholic spirit. They appear, says Neander,‡ for the first time, as a constant and regular institution, fixed to definite terms, about the end of the second or the beginning of the third century; and it was in this case a peculiarity of one country, where particular local causes may have introduced such an arrangement earlier than in other regions. This country was, in fact, exactly Greece, where, from the time of the Achaic league, the system of confederation had maintained itself; and as christianity is able to connect itself with all the peculiarities of a people, provided they contain nothing immoral, and entering into them, to take itself a peculiar form resembling

* Riddle's *Christ. Antiq.* p. 223.

† Neander's *Hist. of the Chr. Relig. and Ch.* vol. i. p. 208, &c.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 212.

them, so also it might easily happen, *that here the civil federal spirit which already existed, worked upon the ecclesiastical catholic spirit*, and gave it earlier than in other regions, a tolerably good form, so that out of the representative assemblies of the civil communities, the Amphictyonic councils, were formed the representative assemblies of the ecclesiastical communities, that is, the provincial synods.

Thus evident is it, that whether we look to the doctrines, the spirit, or the institutions of christianity, it was deeply imbued with the essential principles of republicanism. We might suppose that these principles had been derived from our own American union, were it not certain that our union derived them from christianity. ‘And we all know,’ says Mr. Webster, in his Address on Bunker Hill,* ‘that it (the American revolution) could not have lived a single day under any well founded imputation of possessing a tendency adverse to the christian religion.’ Something analogous was indeed found in the Hebrew republic, and, as derived from it, in the democracies of Greece; but ‘the church councils,’ as even a prelatist confesses, are perhaps the first decided instance in the world’s history, of the adoption of the representative mode of government,† through a confederation of independent republics.‡ Such, also, is the opinion of Sir James Mackintosh, who, in his History of England says, ‘the synods and councils formed by the clergy, afforded the first pattern of elective and representative assemblies, which were adopted by the independent genius of the Germanic race,’ for many ages.‡

* 1825, p. 30.

† Keble on Tradition, p. 144.

‡ Hist. of Eng. vol. i. p. 43. See also Vaughan’s Life of Wickliffe, vol. i. 12, 13. The late Dewitt Clinton took the same view, having declared that ‘christianity is in its essence, its doctrines, and its forms, republican.’ See Dr. Spring’s Obligations of the World to the Bible, p. 115.

And it was the glory of the reformation, that by the power of God, who lifted up a standard against the enemy, it expelled from the church that anti-christian hierarchy, which had usurped the powers of government, and wielded a spiritual despotism over the enslaved people ; and that it restored these disfranchised members of Christ's body, the laity, to the discharge of their proper duties in it, and to the consciousness of their supreme and paramount importance.*

* Dr. Arnold. See on this subject, Dr. Spring's *Obligations of the World to the Bible*, Lect. iv.

CHAPTER II.

PRESBYTERY REPUBLICAN BOTH IN ITS DOCTRINAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL SYSTEMS.

SECTION I.

What denominations are included under the term presbytery in the present argument.

WE are now to show that these republican principles are found embodied and carried out in the doctrines and order of the presbyterian church. We wish it, however, to be again borne in mind, that, while we shall take, as our model, our own standards and discipline, that nevertheless, we include under the term presbyterian, all denominations which are governed by ministers who are recognised as of one order, and who, as well as their other officers, are chosen, are removable, and are supported, by the people ; who acknowledge the right and duty of confederated associations among the churches, composed of lay and clerical delegates, for mutual advice, direction, and control ; and who, while republican, are not *strictly* democratical, or congregational. Our remarks, therefore, will substantially apply to the Baptist churches, who meet in associations ; — to the Lutheran church ; — to the Reformed church ; — to the Dutch Reformed church ; — to the Protestant Methodist church ; — and to the whole body of the New England Puritans, although now generally denominated congregationalists. This, however, is not their true character. They are *essentially* presby-

terian in their ministry;—in their church officers, who are substantially ruling elders;—in their mode of educating, licensing, calling, ordaining, and installing pastors;—in their mode of trial and appeal, before ecclesiastical councils, composed of delegated members;—and in their associations or consociations, which meet at regular periodic times, and exercise all the powers of our synods. The Cambridge and Saybrook platforms, which are still acknowledged by them, are almost identical with the Westminster standards. Any thing ‘savoring of *independency*,’ was in time past treated as something new and unheard of.* President Dale, of Yale College, told Dr. Lang, he had never heard of their being designated by any other name than presbyterians in that State, till he was thirty years of age.† The pilgrim fathers of New England distinctly repudiated the system of pure independency, originally established in England. This will appear from the valuable work of Cotton, edited by the celebrated Thomas Godwin and Philip Nye, and recently reprinted in Boston. These authors maintain that Christ gave ‘unto the elders or presbytery, in each congregation, a binding power of rule and authority peculiar unto them;’ that synods, composed of ‘a communion or association of churches sending their elders,’ is also an ordinance of Christ, and has ‘authority to determine, declare, and enjoin such things as may tend to the reducing of such congregations to right order and peace;‡ and that their scheme of church government is the ‘middle way between that which is called Brownism and the presbyterial government.§ The present deacons of congregational churches are substantially the ruling elders of presbyterian churches, their councils our presbyteries,

* See Dr. Lang’s *Relig. and Educ. in America*, p. 56, where he quotes Dr. Worcester’s *Disc.* p. 53.

† *Ibid.*, p. 58. See the whole of the chapter.

‡ *The Keys of Heaven*, Boston, 1843. Ep. to the reader, p. 7, &c.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

and their consociations our synods. All, therefore, that is good in the present system, or the past working, of New England puritanism, we claim for presbyterianism; and all its evils, and the present dangerous symptoms of departure from the faith of their fathers, by a *portion* of their churches, we attribute, in part, to the undue preponderance of the *democratic* over the *republican* principle.*

SECTION II.

Presbytery republican in its doctrines.

Now that our *doctrines* are in their spirit and influence most conformable to the principles of republicanism, has been already manifested.† Liberty of conscience, liberty of opinion, the right and duty of private judgment, and the liberty of expressing freely the views and opinions of the mind; these principles of republicanism are found written among the cardinal verities of our faith, as with

* Dr. Owen argues against the alleged democracy of congregationalism. See works, vol. xx. p. 480. See also Dr. Lang, *ibid*, pp. 64, 65. See also Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. pp. 184, 186. Dr. Hodge's Hist. of the Presb. Ch. vol. i. ch. 1. The present congregationalists of England are also adopting the essential principles of presbyterianism. They have their county unions. In cities they manage their common interests, by a committee appointed for that purpose. 'But,' says Dr. Vaughan, (Congregationalism, p. 54, 55,) 'it is only within the last ten years that we have availed ourselves of this liberty so fully, as in the organization of this union—the one central union, made up of nearly all the county unions of England and Wales. It is well known that the object we have thus realized, is precisely that which was contemplated by Dr. Owen, and other fathers of independency in England before the restoration. It was to form a union of this nature, that a large number of ministers and laymen were at that time convened, from all parts of the country, in the Savoy Palace; and the platform of a congregational union, embracing all the congregational ministers and churches in the land, was agreed upon, and made public. But with the restoration came the end of religious liberty, and an end, of course, to the possibility of perpetuating this enlarged association of our body.'

† See ch. i. § 4, p. 35, &c.

the point of a diamond.* The pulpit was to the church in other ages, what the press is to the world now. This was the last refuge of down-trodden truth, the last bulwark of an enslaved people against their spiritual oppressors. To the pulpit, and the freedom of discussion which it allowed, do we owe all the reforms that have ever rescued the church from her debasing corruptions. Here Wickliffe aroused a slumbering nation. Here Luther thundered, Zuingle persuaded, and Calvin taught. Here Knox and Melville achieved for Scotland, what had been accomplished for Europe. What calumny is more constantly uttered against the fathers of presbyterianism, and the system generally, than their unwarrantable liberty of speech.† Neither was it without cause, that arbitrary monarchs and despotic prelates raged against this freedom, and by all possible artifices endeavored to gag and choke its free utterance. ‘Persons,’ says Dr. McCrie,‡ ‘may declaim at their pleasure on the insufferable license in which the preachers indulged; but it will be found, that the discouragement of vice and impiety, the checking of the most crying abuses in the administration of justice, and the preserving of common peace and order in the country, de-

* See Dr. Miller on the Min. ed. of 1830, p. xxxvi. *Scottish Chr. Herald*, 1838, p. 231. *Brown’s Vind. of Presb. Ch. Govt.* pp. 15, 17, 18, 33. *Presb. Defended*, pp. 176–179. *Gillespie’s Aaron’s Rod Blossoming*, pp. 176–182.

† An anecdote is told of James commanding Bruce, when raging at his majesty’s conduct, to come down from the pulpit, or to speak sense, and of Bruce declaring that he would do neither.

‡ *Life of Melville*, ii. 76. See also vol. i. pp. 302, 304, for some very fine remarks. See also Dr. Aiton’s *Life and Times of Alexander Henderson*, p. 46, where Dr. Cook is quoted as saying, ‘we must, if we calmly investigate the history of the period at present under review, be satisfied that we, in a great degree, owe to the intrepidity of the clergy the liberties which we enjoy, and that, had they remained silent, not branding the measures which they saw to be pregnant with the heaviest evils, the king would either have destroyed every vestige of freedom, or what was more likely, his throne would have been subverted, and Scotland delivered into the hands of a merciless and bigoted tyrant.’

pended on the freedom of the pulpit, to a degree which no one, who is not particularly acquainted with the state of things at that period, can conceive.

But, without going into any general analysis of doctrines, we would remark that there are three principles which lie at the basis of our presbyterian system, doctrinally considered, and which will, wherever fully sustained and carried out, secure by their necessary tendencies, civil and religious liberty. To these we more especially advert, because they are the very points selected by bishop Hughes, as proof of the *opposition* of the doctrines of our church to the principles of civil and religious liberty.* One is the supreme authority of holy scripture, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the only authoritative promulgator of heaven's will, and this, without any intervening authority of the church, in its fathers, councils, popes, or prelates. Another is the doctrine of grace, the freeness, efficacy, and unencumbered sufficiency of that justification, which is obtained through the imputed righteousness of Christ, and received only by faith in his finished work, and once offered sacrifice.

Animated by these principles, no man can be a slave to the spiritual despotism of a hierarchy. Redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled from all necessary dependence, for either the knowledge or the enjoyment of God, upon any fellow being, man, in the faith of these doctrines, stands erect in his own proper stature. He feels his individual responsibility, and his infinite obligations to God. He ceases to be an ignorant devotee, and

* See Breckinridge and Hughes's Discussion, Philad. 1836, pp. 285, 286, &c. Even this wily sophist, however, does not pretend to found his argument upon what these doctrines are, *in themselves*, but upon certain most illogical and most absurd *consequences*, which he deduces from them,—a practice, which, of itself, betrays the cloven foot of that despotism, which condemns men by *constructive* evidence, where there is no *positive* proof.

becomes a spiritual worshipper of that Being who is a Spirit. And while he bows reverently to the will and authority of God, he spurns from him that interference of a fellow mortal, which would claim a dominion over his faith. These are doctrines, as has been ably remarked,* with which no forms of superstition, no spiritual despotism, will ever be made to consist; and which doctrines, while in their aspect toward man, individually as a sinner, they afford the only ground of hope; so, in their less direct, but inevitable influence over the condition of man in society, constitute the unobtrusive, but effectual guarantee of national liberties. They do so, as well by the firm moral tone which they impart to the social system, as by the necessity they involve of a constant appeal to the supreme authority of scripture:—for this very appeal implies religious liberty; and religious liberty secures political liberty.

With the reception or rejection of these doctrines stand or fall, asceticism, superstition, and despotism, or, as they may be otherwise termed, monkery, demonolatry, and hierarchical tyranny—those powerful ingredients in all the various forms of human corruption and debasement. The testimony of Bancroft to this truth is very striking.† ‘Years are to ‘fools’ as days in the providence of God, and in the progress of the race. After long waiting, an Augustine monk at Wittenberg, who had seen the lewd corruptions of the Roman court, and who loathed the deceptions of a coarse superstition, brooded in his cell over the sins of his age, and the method of rescuing conscience from the dominion of forms, till he discovered a cure for its vices in the simple idea of justification by faith alone. With this principle, easily intelligible to the universal mind, and spreading, like an

* Isaac Taylor, in Pref. to Life of Luther. London Chr. Ob. Aug. 1840, p. 503.

† History of United States, vol. ii. p. 459.

epidemic, widely and rapidly, — a principle strong enough to dislodge every superstition, to overturn every tyranny, to enfranchise, convert, and save the world, — he broke the wand of papal supremacy, scattered the lazars of the monasteries, and drove the penance of fasts, and the terrors of purgatory, masses for the dead, and indulgences for the living, into the paradise of fools.’

Not less remarkable is the estimate of these doctrines, made by Sir James Mackintosh.* ‘It was fortunate also,’ he says, ‘that the enormities of Tetzel,’ (the pope’s retailer of indulgences,) ‘found Luther busied in the contemplation of the principle, which is the basis of all ethical judgment, and by the power of which he struck a mortal blow at superstition;’ namely, ‘men are not made truly righteous by performing certain actions which are *externally good*, but men must have righteous principles in the first place; and then they will not fail to perform virtuous actions.’ He calls it ‘a proposition equally certain and sublime;’ and adds, that Luther, in a more special application of his principle, used it to convey his doctrine of justification by faith.’ And again he says, ‘in justice to him, the *civil historian should never omit the benefits which accrued to the moral interests of society from this principle.*’ This principle is the merit of Christ, made ours by the power of God, working faith in us; and by union to Christ, making us free from guilt and pollution. To this christians are, by God’s decree, predestinated. This secures moral liberty, and moral rectitude; makes a man ‘a law unto himself’ — and therefore a good citizen; the freest, noblest, and most just of men.’

Such are the views of philosophers, in giving an impartial verdict on the influence of presbyterian doctrines upon civil and religious liberty. But the doctrine of predesti-

* Hist. of Eng. vol. ii. pp. 120, 121, and Breckinridge and Hughes’, Discuss. p. 309.

nation remains to be considered, upon which, and its implied principles, the objector mainly relies. Now it would be easy to show how this doctrine, properly understood, lays the axe to the very root of all human pride, and establishes, upon an immovable foundation, the doctrine of human equality; the utter nothingness of all human distinctions; and the perfect independence of every man upon every other man, for eternal life, and for all spiritual blessings. We are, however, able to present the testimony of Mr. Bancroft, who cannot be supposed by any one to cherish favorable sentiments towards this doctrine, as to its *actual* results.

‘Calvinism,’ he says,* ‘is gradual republicanism.’ ‘In Geneva, a republic on the confines of France, Italy, and Germany, Calvin, appealing to the people for support, continued the career of enfranchisement, by planting the institutions which nursed the minds of Rousseau, Necker, and De Stael.’

‘The political character of Calvinism, which, with one consent, and with instinctive judgment, the monarchs of that day feared as republicanism, and which Charles I. declared a religion unfit for a gentleman, is expressed in a single word — *predestination*. Did a proud aristocracy trace its lineage through generations of a high-born ancestry, the republican reformer, with a loftier pride, invaded the invisible world, and from the book of life brought down the record of the noblest enfranchisement, decreed from all eternity by the King of kings. His few converts defied the opposing world as a world of reprobates, whom God had despised and rejected. To them the senses were a totally depraved foundation, on which neither truth nor goodness could rest. They went forth in confidence that men who were kindling with the same exalted instincts, would listen to their voice, and be effectually ‘called into

* Hist. of United States, vol. ii. pp. 461 – 463.

the brunt of the battle' by their side. And, standing serenely amidst the crumbling fabrics of centuries of superstitions, they had faith in one another; and the martyrdoms of Cambray, the fires of Smithfield, the surrender of benefices by two thousand non-conforming presbyterians, attest their perseverance. And what were the results ?'

'Such was the system,' adds this writer, 'which, for a century and a half, assumed the guardianship of liberty for the English world. 'A wicked tyrant is better than a wicked war,' said Luther, preaching non-resistance; and Cranmer echoed back, 'God's people are called to render obedience to governors, although they be wicked or wrongdoers, and in no case to resist.' 'Civil magistrates,' replied English Calvinism, — I quote the very words, in which, under an extravagant form, its champion asserted the paramount power of general principles, and the inalienable rights of freedom, — 'civil magistrates must be servants unto the church; they must remember to submit their sceptres, to throw down their crowns before the church, yea, as the prophet speaketh, to lick the dust of the feet of the church.' To advance intellectual freedom, Calvinism denied, absolutely denied, the sacrament of ordination; thus breaking up the great monopoly of priestcraft, and scattering the ranks of superstition. 'Kindle the fire before myface,' said Jerome, meekly, as he resigned himself to his fate; to quench the fires of persecution forever, Calvinism resisted with fire and blood, and shouldering the musket, proved, as a foot-soldier, that, on the field of battle, the invention of gunpowder had levelled the plebeian and the knight. To restrain absolute monarchy in France, in Scotland, in England, it allied itself with the party of the past, the decaying feudal aristocracy, which it was sure to outlive; to protect itself against feudal aristocracy, it infused itself into the mercantile class, and the inferior gentry; to secure a life in the public mind, in Geneva, in

Scotland, wherever it gained dominion, it invoked intelligence for the people, and in every parish planted the common school.’

SECTION III.

The framers of our ecclesiastical system designed that it should neither be a monarchy, nor a democracy, but a republic.

BUT we will pass on to the contemplation of our system in its ecclesiastical bearings.

In framing her constitution, the great object before the church in this country, was, to present such general principles, as would, if honestly carried out, and faithfully maintained, secure, on the one hand, union, efficiency, and a well-ordered government, with the power of guarding against all traitorous designs upon the purity or peace of the church; and at the same time, best uphold the just rights of the several churches, of individual ministers, and of the lay members of the church. Liberty, as far as it can be enjoyed without anarchy; government, so far as it is compatible with liberty; and the greatest possible enjoyment of both;—this was the glorious aim and object, to secure which our fathers earnestly labored. Our ecclesiastical constitution was cradled in the spirit of liberty.* Even bishop Hughes, filled to the very brim as he is with envenomed hate against our church, has confessed, that those tenets in the Westminster confession, which were hostile to civil liberty, ‘were discarded, (by the American presbyterian church,) as being unsuited to the soil of new-born liberty and of equal rights.’ ‘The confession of

* See this well illustrated by Dr. Rice, in *Evang. Mag.* vol. ix, pp. 26, 27, 28, 535, 536.

faith was forthwith amended,' he adds, 'to suit the constitution and the new order of things.'* And he urges against us that very principle of freedom, by which we were ready, on discovering preëxisting error, to abandon and subvert it.† Most strange infatuation! Since he thus seals the everlasting condemnation of the system of popery, seeing that what it *has been*, it *must ever* remain, the same determined foe to civil and religious liberty. Presbyterians, however, never regarded their standards as either infallible or unchangeable. They are not our rule, either of faith or practice. They are not substituted for the scriptures, nor do they claim its authority. Any thing which has been admitted into them contrary to either civil or religious freedom, may, therefore, at any time be removed. And so it was in the present instance. Our standards were amended on the very points to which this author alludes, *before* the adoption of the American constitution, — not in consequence of it. The spirit of liberty and of republicanism, which they breathe, was the cause, and not the effect, of American liberty. The founders of the presbyterian church brought with them to this country an inextinguishable love of liberty, both civil and religious.‡

Speaking of the presbyterian settlers in the colony of South Carolina, long previous to the revolution, Dr. Hewett says,§ — 'these ministers adopted this mode of religious worship, not only from a persuasion of its conformity to the primitive apostolic form, but also from a conviction of its being, of all others, the most favorable to civil liberty, equality, and independence.' This spirit was enkindled by the reformation, and taught to give expression to its views, by those solemn leagues and covenants into which

* Breckinridge and Hughes's Discuss. p. 303.

† Ibid, p. 289.

‡ Dr. Rice, in Evang. Mag. p. 27.

§ Hist. of S. C. Lond. 1779, vol. ii. p. 53.

the reformers in Germany, and in Scotland, and the puritans in England entered, for their mutual defence, for the overthrow of tyranny, and for the establishment of constitutional liberty, civil and religious. Let any one compare their language with that of our declaration of independence, and he will perceive in the former the parents of the latter.*

Our system of polity, says Dr. Rice,† was drawn up at a time when the general principles of government, and the great subject of human rights and privileges, was more thoroughly and anxiously discussed than at any other period since the settlement of this country. It was during the time when the sages of America were employed in framing the Federal constitution, and considering its merits, throughout the United States. And the men who drew up this plan of government for the church, were, many of them at least, men deeply versed in civil and ecclesiastical history; and who had borne no inconsiderable part in the eventful period which preceded. Perhaps this may in some measure account for the striking similarity which occurs in the fundamental principles of our polity, and the form of government adopted by the United States of America. Like that form of government, our polity is neither monarchical, nor democratical, but a democratic republic.

‘The Church,’ writes Cartwright, in his Reply to Whitgift,‡ ‘is governed with that kind of government which the philosophers that write of the best commonwealths affirm to be the best. For in respect of Christ, the head, it is a monarchy; and in respect of the ancients and pastors, that govern in common, and with like authority amongst themselves, it is an aristocracy, or the rule of

* See my Disc. on the Hist. Infl. and Results of the Westminst. Ass. McCrie on the Unity of the Ch. App. p. 156, &c. and Note to ch. iii.

† Ibid, p. 28.

‡ Price’s Hist. of Nonconf. vol. i. p. 249.

the best men ; and in respect that the people are not secluded but have their interest in church matters, it is a democracy, or popular estate.' Such were the views entertained by the framers of our constitution. To constitute the church visible monarchical, was, in their opinion, to dethrone Christ, to proclaim rebellion against his supremacy and kingly rule, and to introduce tyranny and spiritual despotism. To constitute the church a pure democracy would have equally secured the destruction of her character, and have defeated her end ; since, as has been seen, such a form of government cannot, in the nature of things, long subsist. It were idle to call the *perfectly independent* government of each christian society a government. It is no government at all, unless we will call every family a society, and its rulers a government. And even if the contrary were granted, most certainly no analogy could be found in such separate and disunited bodies to our confederated union, which is made up of all the parishes in each state, and of all the states throughout its entire extent of territory. Our fathers, therefore, left our church under that constitution given her by her divine Head, by which we have seen she is a democratic republic.

Our church is therefore the union of many churches ;—a union so devised as that, while each is left in a measure independent, the whole are harmonized and made strong. The love of liberty is combined with the love of unity, the consolidated power of union, with the diffused power of popular freedom. It resembles the far-famed Grecian phalanx, in which each man was fully armed, and the whole so combined as to form one moving mass of skill and courage, bearing like a mountain against the opposing foe.

SECTION IV.

All the principles of republicanism are found in our presbyterian system.

Is equality of conditions the fundamental principle from which all our other civil and republican institutions flow? This doctrine is imbedded in every principle, and is characteristic of, the presbyterian church. ‘We lay it down,’ says Dr. Rice,* one of the fathers of presbyterianism in this country, ‘as a fundamental principle in our system of polity, that ecclesiastical power is by the Lord Jesus Christ vested in the church; it belongs to the body of the faithful people.’ Separate and distinct from the church, its officers have no independent or irresponsible authority.† The title of clergy we recognise as given by inspiration to all God’s people,‡ and possessed by them until pope Higinus, and the succeeding prelates, appropriated it to themselves, condemning the rest of God’s inheritance to the ‘injurious and alienate condition of laity;’ separating them by local partitions in their churches; and thus excluding the members of Christ from all offices in the ecclesiastical body, ‘as if they meant to sew up that Jewish veil which Christ, by his death on the cross, rent in sunder.’ Against these usurpations, and this whole system of priestcraft, we earnestly protest. All such distinctions we repudiate. Every faithful disciple of the Lord Jesus we admit to wait upon the tabernacle, and to offer up spiritual sacrifice to God, in whatever office God and the congregation shall assign him. Presbyterianism, both as it regards the government of a particular church and of the church generally, is, therefore, based upon the principle

* Evangelical Magaz. vol. ix. p. 535.

† Ibid, p. 537.

‡ By the apostle Peter.

of representation. 'Our laws too are all written laws, made and administered by our own representatives. We have no *rulers*.'*

The support of the ministry, the expenses of the congregation, the advancement of every cause of christian benevolence, are all voluntary on the part of the people; and the amount in each case assessed by the people themselves, or by the conscience of each individual contributor. Our church property is all held in the name of trustees elected by the people; and the temporal affairs of every congregation are managed by the people.

Is it then the great characteristic of our republic, that all power is ultimately resident in, and derived from, the people, and this, not as the gift of man, but of God?—What can be more analogous than the principles of our presbyterian constitution? Do we not teach that the divine charter of the church was vested in the people and not in the clergy.† The church is, we contend, the whole body of the faithful, and not the officers or ministers of the church. These officers and ministers exist for the people, and not the people for them. We place their right and authority of office, not in these offices themselves, but in the entire church, for whose benefit alone they are intrusted to them by Christ.‡

The recognition of the rights of the people is one of those points upon which all presbyterian churches, both Lutheran and Calvinian, are agreed. The laity are regarded by them all as an integral part of the church. Their civil rights are represented as in all respects equal to those of the clergy. Laymen are associated with the clergy in all acts of ecclesiastical government and legislation. These churches also maintain and hold forth the right and duty

* Balt. Lit. and Relig. Mag. Feb. 1814. 76.

† See the Author's Work, Presbytery, and not Prelacy, the Script. and Primit. 1 ol. B. i. ch. iii.

‡ Claude's Def. of the Ref. vol. ii. pp. 241, 247, 263.

of the people to exercise private judgment, to read the scriptures, to partake of the cup in the sacrament, and to cherish liberty of conscience, and liberty of opinion.*

The presbyterian church, as reformed, and thus restored to her ancient polity and liberty in the kingdom of Scotland, as well as on the continent, was bottomed upon the coöperation and influence of the laity. An appeal to the people, in their own language, was the first step of her reformers.† In this respect does she stand, confessedly, in contrast to the church of England. In presbyterian churches the reformation was begun, continued, and effected *by* the people; in the latter *for* the people and against their wishes.‡ In the former, the people were the prime agents and inciters to the work; in the latter, they were either passive subjects, or sullen remonstrants. In the former, the people reformed themselves, and erected a platform agreeable to their own views of what christianity should and was designed to be; in the latter, the people abjured or received their faith, according to the fashion of the court. It has always therefore been the reproach of the church of Scotland, ‘with those who do not care for, or who dread the people, that she is too popular.’§

SECTION V.

Presbytery is republican in its doctrine of the ministry.

This republican character of our church, will be made apparent by considering her doctrine on the ministry.

That her doctrine of the ministry is based upon the recognition of the original power and authority of the

* Conder's Analytical View of all Religion. p. 247.

† See Villers on the Ref. p. 240. Hence the improvement of modern languages, pp. 241, 243.

‡ This is insisted on as an excellency in tract of the Prot. Ep. Tr. Soc. quoted below. Lathbury, in his Hist. of Eng. Episcop. also urges this.

§ Lect. on Headship of Christ, p. 46.

people, we have seen. The church must and will have power, for he who commands the mind will command the body. The question therefore is, to whom this power will be entrusted? To the clergy?—then do you have the worst feature of popery. To the laity alone?—then do you enslave the clergy. To the clergy and laity combined, in their representative capacity, so that neither shall be absolute and supreme?—this is the genius of presbytery, but cannot be reconciled with ‘episcopacy.’*

Our prelatical opponents maintain,† that all ecclesiastical authority is committed directly to the christian ministry; that the ministry consists of an order of men differing from the laity; and that it is their business to come between God and man to transact business with men for heaven: authoritatively to interpret for men the word of God; and, by administering the sacraments, to give them assurance of salvation; in a word, to be substitutes for Christ’s person on earth. Now we hold this doctrine to be utterly popish and heretical; inconsistent with the nature of true religion, as a voluntary service; incompatible with christian liberty; and well suited to give an undue influence to the ministers of religion. The general admission of these pretensions was one cause and that not the least efficient, in producing the great corruption of the church. It brought about that subjugation of the mind to ecclesiastical power, which was one of the striking characteristics of the age of darkness, through which the church groped for nearly ten centuries. Nor does religion alone suffer by the admission of these pretensions. They clothe ecclesiastics with a power to which nothing on earth is equal, and to which, after an unavailing struggle, every thing submits. What will we not surrender to a man, to whom we have surrendered the right of directing our conscience; and whom we regard as invested with authority from heaven

* See Lond. Quart. Rev. Dec. 1839, p. 74, where this is avowed.

† Dr. Rice, in *ibid*, p. 535.

to receive us into the church, or to repel us from it ; to give us assurance of salvation, or cut us off from the hope of mercy ?

Those who contend that there is an order of men in the christian church, who possess rights paramount to the church at large, and for their own benefit and honor, are guilty of the same sophistry with those who argue for the divine right of kings. They forget that these officers themselves are created for the benefit of the community, and that for this purpose alone, are they invested with power. They confound their official with their personal capacity ; their individual with their representative character ; and their dignity of station with their office, which is merely that of trustee ; ascribe to their own persons that which belongs to others, for whose benefit they are required to act as mere trustees, and thus make those to be THE PARTY, who are no more than trustees for that party.* And thus are they led to the absurd and dangerous conclusion, that the clergy possess supreme power in the church, hold their place in absolute independence of the people, and may exercise their functions at their own pleasure, and according to their own views of christian expediency. On the contrary, we maintain, that the ministers of Christ hold their offices solely for the benefit of the church, and in trust for Christ. Not that they are the mere creatures of the people, or can be removed by them at pleasure, since their office is of divine appointment, and clothed with divine authority. But that the people are bound to bring them to the law and the testimony ; to test their preaching by the standard of truth ; to submit to no ordinance which is not accordant to the written law ; and to contend earnestly against them, should they alter or detract from the truth as it is in Jesus

The powers, then, of the christian association, belong to

* Pol. Phil. p. 85.

the whole body of its members, just as, in our republic, the exercise of power is delegated to its officers; so that whatever they do, according to the written constitution, is done by the members, and is valid and authoritative; while on the other hand, whatever they may attempt contrary to that constitution, is invalid, null, and void. Thus also obedience is in no case required to the determinations of the christian ministry, *merely* because they are *theirs*, but because they are consonant to the will of Christ, and are *therefore* binding. But if in any case the ministers teach for doctrines the commandments of men, the people are bound by the command of God to protest against them, and to bring them to the bar of the church.

This dependence of the ministry on the church is implied in our whole system.* It is from among the people they are originally taken. It is by the people they are educated. The people thus commend them as proper candidates, to the presbytery, by whom they are examined and licensed. They are then sent forth among the people, that further opportunity may be given for examining their gifts, and fitness for the sacred office. Should they be found unacceptable to the people, and unsuited to the ministerial office, their licensure is withdrawn, and they return to the body of the people, as private members of the church. In all this, the presbytery act as the divinely appointed agents and trustees of the people, and for the interests of the whole church.

This is further evident in our plan for the settlement of a minister. By the principles of our church, the ministry of any individual to a particular people, the allocation of the minister to that people, and the subjection of the people to him, can be effected by the presbytery, only through means of an *expressed* will on the part of the people, and

* See these views ably presented by Claude, in his Def. of the Ref. vol. ii. pp. 240 - 243, 247, 263.

call from them to that individual, to take pastoral charge over them. And while the presbytery, responsible to a higher court, in view of the interests of the church generally, of which they are the guardians, may, in the face of such a call, refuse to sanction the settlement of any minister, they cannot in any case settle him without it. The christian people have, as *we* believe, a divine right in the call of their ministers.

The right of selecting those to whom we are to intrust the interests of ourselves and of our children, or from whom we are to derive important and most necessary instruction, may certainly be called inalienable, because inherent in, and most congenial to, our nature. But if this is true as it regards the physician for our bodily ailments ; the instructor of our youthful progeny ; the collegiate inspectors and guardians of their maturer years ; or our counsel at the bar of earthly justice ; how much more important does it become, when the interests at stake are those of the never-dying soul ? The right, therefore, to choose those who shall minister unto us in holy things ; at whose hands we shall receive the bread of life ; and from whose stores of sacred learning and divine knowledge we shall draw ; this surely is a privilege, which we might expect to be accorded to us, in the kingdom of God. Nor are we disappointed. For although it is not competent for any man to qualify any other man for the sacred ministry ; nor for the laity to ordain and consecrate those who shall be over them in the Lord ; yet surely it is their right, and one which the laity are fully able to exercise, to select, among those adjudged to be proper incumbents of that sacred office, those whom they believe to be best adapted to promote *their* spiritual welfare. This is a right to which the members of the apostolic and primitive churches were certainly admitted. It is a right which is most fully recognised in the system of presbyterianism, and by which that system is at once eminently distin-

gnished, and shown to be peculiarly adapted to the spirit of a free and independent people.

It is not possible, of course, that *every* individual can be, in all cases, perfectly satisfied ; but this is much more likely to be the case where, as in our churches, all have an opportunity of expressing an opinion, and of exercising a right, and where the decision is finally made by a majority necessarily overwhelming, than where such elections are made by a very few, or where no such elections are at all permitted. We, therefore, to use the words of Milton,* ‘ having already a kind of apostolical and ancient church-election in our state, what a perverseness would it be in us, of all others, to retain forcibly a kind of imperious and stately election in our church ? And what a blindness to think, that what is already evangelical, as it were by a happy chance in our polity, should be repugnant to that which is the same, by divine command, in the ministry ? Thus then we see that our ecclesiastical and political choices, may consent and sort as well together, without any rupture in the state, as christians and freeholders.’

‘ Puritanism,’† says Bancroft, ‘ conceded no such power to its spiritual guides ; the church existed independently of its pastor, who owed his office to its free choice ; the will of the majority was its law ; and each one of the brethren possessed equal rights with the elders. The right, exercised by each congregation, of electing its own ministers, was in itself a moral revolution ; religion was now with the people, not over the people. Puritanism exalted the laity.’

* Wks. vol. i. p. 48.

† Hist. of United States, vol. i. pp. 461, 462, 464.

SECTION VI.

Presbytery is republican in its doctrine of ordination.

Objections answered.

Not less republican is our doctrine of ordination. It is, in fact, the only form of ordination that is truly catholic and popular. It is most perfectly correspondent to that order pursued in the republic, in the induction of its magistrates into office. Magistracy is a relation that must have a foundation, as well as the ministry. And just as the election and consent of the people are sufficient to constitute any individual a magistrate or representative, so does the essence of a call to the ministry consist in the call from God, or imparted fitness ; in the willingness of the individual to enter upon the office ; and in the consent of the people to whom he is to minister.* And as the appointed form of introduction to office designates or inaugurates him, to whom the people have given the power or right, according to the constitution ; so does ordination designate and solemnly set apart to his high calling, the individual who, by the previous call of the people, has been found empowered to enter upon the work of the ministry. In both cases, the power or authority proceeds directly from the constitution, and not from the electors ; and thus do we regard the ministry as authorized, not by men, but by God. In both cases, the *exercise* of preëstablished authority is given by the call and election of the people. In both cases does the form of introduction, (that is, in the case of the ministry, ordination,) suppose the *ascertained* right and title to the office, and is, therefore, no more than a solemn and becoming form of investiture.

Now as ministers are, by their office, servants of the

* Baxter's Disput. on Ch. Govt. p. 232, &c. Claude's Def. of the Ref. vol. ii. part iv. ch. iii.

whole church, and not of any one portion of it merely, it is necessary that the whole body of that church should have a voice in their admission to their trust. Were they to become the servants of other ministers only, then might they be elected, as among prelatists, by the ministry alone. Or were they to become the pastors of a single congregation, as on the *original* plan of the system of independency, then might one single church elect and ordain their pastor. But as christian ministers are to become ministers of the church at large, that church should have a voice in their ordination. And as they cannot manifestly have this in person, or in mass, they must, as in the analogous case of civil presidents, or legislators, exercise it through representatives. Now this the church at large does on the plan of presbyterianism, and on no other. By this the people, whom the minister is immediately to serve, try, examine, and prove him; while the presbytery, composed of lay and ministerial delegates, act on behalf of the church at large; represent their interests in the case; try, examine, and prove the candidate, in the place of the whole people; and when satisfied, induct him into office, in the name, and for the benefit, of the whole church. There is, therefore, in the whole doctrine concerning the ministry, as laid down in the system of presbyterianism, a catholicity, a beauty, and a republicanism, which will be in vain looked for in any other. Our clergy are the ministers of the people, and empowered by them to serve them in the gospel. They are all of them sustained by the ennobling thought, that they are chosen by the people, and clothed by them with all the dignity and authority they possess. They all, too, stand upon the same platform of official equality. None of them are 'inferior,' and, as such, 'insulted, as in England, by the mockery of an election;' nor as within the Roman jurisdiction, required to receive a master who is himself a slave.*

* The Churchman's Monthly Rev. June, 1841, p. 313.

Is it objected, that the clergy have a certain aristocratical influence in the church, resulting from their character, studies, and relations? Grant, that the ministry do constitute a check to the unreflecting passions and revolutionary spirit of the multitude; is there nothing analogous to this in our republic? The magistrates, judges, and all the other officers of government, our representatives, senators, and lawyers, who share in its stability and wealth, serve also as a kind of aristocracy, to break off the wild deluge of fierce and anarchical democracy in the state, and as the connecting link and bond between the two great classes of society, the governing, and those for whom they govern.* And it is by the possession of these aristocratic elements, this elective and responsible nobility, not of wealth, but of office and dignity, that both the civil government of the land, and the ecclesiastical government of our church, are constituted **REPUBLICS**, and are distinguished from **PURE DEMOCRACIES**.

SECTION VII.

*Presbytery eminently republican in its office of ruling elders.
Objections answered.*

Let us now pass on to the consideration of the office of ruling elders in the presbyterian church. This office may be shown to be eminently republican, either as divinely instituted, or as having resulted from the principle of representation, the power of the church having been originally vested in the people. Republican society is based on the principle, that arbiters, magistrates, or representatives, chosen by the consent of the people, in all the several districts, shall judge and determine the causes of wrong and injury,

* See Tocquev. vol. i. pp. 298, 300, 304, and vol. ii. p. 325.

whether public or private. And thus does the free and solemn consent of the church, in the election of elders, give authority unto such persons, in subordination to the laws of the church. 'Hence,' says our Form of Government, 'ruling elders are properly the representatives of the people, chosen by them for the purpose of exercising government and discipline.'*

As to the necessity for some such officers, who, that reflects, can doubt. Does the church, we ask, or does it not, consist of ministers only? If it does not—and we deny that in *any one* passage in the New Testament, the term can be understood of ministers merely—then by what rule of equity, human or divine, are the laity to be excluded from a share in the government of the church? Or if, as we have proved, the power of the church was vested by Christ, in the whole body of the church,† who shall dare to exclude the laity from the proper exercise of that power.

Now this undeniable fact, that the laity compose the great body of the church of Christ, was the chief ground upon which the necessity of the eldership has been ever urged. 'Our divines,' says Mr. George Gillespie, in his assertion of the government of the church of Scotland,‡ 'prove against papists, that some of these, whom they call laicks, ought to have a place in the assemblies of the church, by this argument among the rest; because, otherwise, the whole church could not be thereby represented. And it is plain enough, that the church cannot be represented, except the hearers of the word, which are the far greatest part of the church, be represented. By the ministers of the word, they cannot be represented, more than the burghs can be represented in parliament by the noblemen, or by the commissioners of shires; therefore, by

* Ch. v. See Paget's Def. of Presb. Ch. Govt. pp. 4, 5.

† See Presbytery and not Prelacy the Scriptural and Primitive Polity, B. i. ch. iii.

‡ Part i. cap. 4.

some of their own kind must they be represented, that is, by such as are hearers, and not preachers. Now some hearers cannot represent all the rest, except they have a calling and commission thereto; and who can these be but ruling elders? And again, when the council of Trent was first spoken of in the Diet at Wortimberg, Anno. 1522, all the estates of Germany desired of pope Adrian VI., that admittance might be granted, as well to laymen as to clergymen, and that not only as witnesses and spectators, but to be judges there. This they could not obtain, therefore they would not come to the council, and published a book, where they allege this for one cause of their not coming to Trent, because none had voice there but cardinals, bishops, abbots, generals, or superiors of orders, whereas laicks also ought to have a decisive voice in councils. If none but the ministers of the word should sit and have a voice in a synod, then it could not be a church representative; because the most part of the church (who are the hearers and not the teachers of the word) are not represented in it. A common cause ought to be concluded by common voices. But that which is treated of in councils, is a common cause, pertaining to many particular churches. Our divines, when they prove against papists, that the election of ministers, and the excommunication of obstinate sinners, ought to be done by the suffrages of the whole church, make use of this same argument; that which concerneth all, ought to be treated of and judged by all.'

So argued one of Scotland's noble sons, and a representative in the Westminster Assembly of Divines. And such, also, are the general views of the presbyterian church.* In nothing, therefore, does she proclaim her republican character more fully and undeniably, than in

* See Professor Jameson's Cyp. Isot. pp. 554 - 556, and 517, 540 - 544.

her ruling elders. They are not ministers. They are not presbyters. But they are delegates from the people, officers chosen by them; and representatives, to whom they have transferred their power, to whom they have committed their interests, and who are expected to act for the best good of the whole body of the christian people. They constitute, therefore, with the pastor of every church, the senate, or the house of representatives of that church. They also sit, vote, and act, in full terms of equality, with the ministers, in all the other courts; so that, in them all, the people are *fully* and freely represented.

But it may be said, that in the presbyterian form, ruling elders usurp the power of the people at large, and, in fact, constitute another privileged class.* But these elders are elective. They are chosen by the people, and from among themselves, and have no power but that intrusted to them under the laws. Now the purest republic may delegate legislative, executive, and judicial power to certain individuals, or bodies, leaving to the community no more than the choice of these ruling officers, and still the government remain purely republican, and not at all mixed.† It has only delegated its power to representatives. No individual in the community has power independent of the people. Nor have the people shared their powers with others, but only deputed to others the power of exercising *their* authority. And in like manner, ruling elders, being the chosen deputies of the people, and exercising their powers in full responsibility to the people, are perfectly accordant with our republican institutions, and to the supreme power of the body of the church.

*Hooker, B. v. Decl. § 8, vol. ii. p. 8, Keble's ed.

†Polit. Phil. p. 77, Lond. 1842.

SECTION VIII.

Presbytery eminently republican, also, in its various ecclesiastical judicatories.

We come now to notice the various ecclesiastical courts by which the laws of the presbyterian church are administered.

In the most free states, it is common for persons to be deputed by the people, who together constitute an assembly, representing the whole; and it is usual for the whole, in such cases, to consider themselves bound by the decision of this general body. Such are the town councils, the state legislatures, and the congress in these United States. The importance of such bodies cannot be over estimated. Governments usually fall a sacrifice to impotence or tyranny. These are the Scylla and Charybdis, against which they have to watch. And their free assemblies are the pilots by whom they are to be kept awake to danger, and guided safely through it.* With free deliberative, legislative assemblies, liberty, civil and religious, has coexisted or expired. It has also been shown by president Adams,† from a review of the history of all the mixed and free governments which have ever existed from the earliest records of time, that single assemblies, without check or balance, or a government with all authority collected into one centre, according to the notion of Mr. Turgot, were visionary, violent, intriguing, corrupt, and tyrannical dominations of majorities over minorities, and which have uniformly and rapidly terminated their career in a profligate despotism. It is most clear, that tyranny would unavoidably increase

* See Kent's Comment. vol. i. p. 233.

† In *ibid*, p. 223.

with equality, unless the members of the community are protected by such associations, as will enable them to resist a power, against which, single-handed, they could never prevail. Every wealthy, talented, and powerful individual, forms in reality the head of a body, composed of all under his influence, and by which he rules the rest. And it is only by having around them the shield of such legal assemblies, the poor and less influential members of society can stand upon their rights.

Look now at the presbyterian form of church government. Its fundamental principle is, that the government of the church rests upon delegated bodies, composed of clerical and lay members.* It demands, therefore, congregational, district, provincial, and general assemblies of such members; that is, church sessions, presbyteries, and a general assembly. By these local associations, and general confederations, national, as well as local freedom, are promoted and secured. In our churches, and church sessions, we see, that parish system of local government, to which Tocqueville looks as the unquestionable germ and model of our American institutions.† In our presbyteries we have the district system, the townships, and municipal bodies by which the public spirit is preserved, and which ‘constitute the strength of free nations.’‡ In our synods, we find the legislatures of our several states, which are justly regarded as the bulwarks of their liberty. And in our general assembly, we have the national ecclesiastical congress. Each of these courts is bound to regulate itself by the laws of the great community; while not one of those laws is to be entered on the statute-book, till the consent of those whom it is

* See the analogy between these, and republican principles, drawn out by Brown, in his *Vind. of Presb. Ch. Govt.* Edinb. 1812, pp. 15, 174, 175.

† Tocquev. i. pp. 28, 40, 85.

‡ Tocquev. i. 62, and ch. 5, generally.

to control has been asked, through the medium of their legitimate judicatories.* Each church is a young republic, having its popular assemblies, its delegated representatives, its local tribunal, its independent by-laws, and the entire and exclusive management of all matters which are purely local. Each congregation is thus a commonwealth, as truly as each synod. It has its own important and independent sphere of action, and is a type of the general government of the whole church. Here the laity—the people—rule and reign. The minister stands alone, one against a host; chosen by the free votes, supported by the voluntary contribution, and made useful only by the esteem and confidence of the people, he ministers to them in holy things. In the session he is one in association with several, and can exercise no more than a moral influence.

By the constitution of these church sessions all churches are equal among themselves, and all the members of each church equal to every other;† so that every member of our church is assured, if in any way liable to discipline, of a fair hearing, before a body composed of his fellow members, and of his own order, and from whose judgment he may appeal to the higher tribunal *of the presbytery*.‡ To confine the decisions of all cases which must arise in every well-ordered society, to the clergymen, or to the clergy alone, and thus to consolidate in their hands, the entire government of the body, is contrary to the very first law of all society, which provides that no man shall be judge in his own cause. On this principle, there is no society, no freedom, no protection from oppressive and despotic rule, no bulwark against that resistless tide, with which power, when lodged in the hands of a few weak and imperfect men, encroaches upon the territory,

* Dr. Muir's Disc. in Commem. of 1638, p. 15.

† See Brown's Vind. of Presb. Ch. Govt. p. 167.

‡ See Jones's Wks. vol. ii. p. 421, on the value of this arrangement.

and the just rights, of all who are opposed to it. Nor can that ecclesiastical system be possibly republican, or consonant to the genius of our free commonwealths, which subjugates the laity to the clergy, and the inferior clergy, as they are ignobly called, to the higher, and which attaches a supremacy of power to an aristocratic class.

But in the system of presbyterianism there is no privileged order or class, as it regards their personal rights. No single member of the church is excluded from an active interest in the affairs of the spiritual republic. In its temporalities, all its supporters have a voice. In all its spiritualities, every qualified male member has an equal interest and voice. In every ecclesiastical court, from the church session, which is the lowest, to the general assembly, which is the highest, the chosen representatives of the people sit as coequal members with their ministerial brethren. And it is morally impossible, for any act to be passed, in any judicatory of our church, or enforced in any portion of it, which is adverse to the interests and to the wishes of a majority of its members.

The spiritual affairs, so far as they appertain to the district within its territory, and to the interests of all the churches included in it, are in like manner conducted by our presbyteries, to which any one aggrieved by the course pursued in the churches may appeal, and have his cause heard before an impartial tribunal. In the same way do our synods take order for securing the peace, unity, and prosperity, of all the churches within their wider limits. The church being divided* 'into many separate congregations, these need mutual counsel and assistance, in order to preserve soundness of doctrine, and regularity of discipline, and to enter into common measures for promoting knowledge, and religion, and for preventing infidelity, error, and immorality. Hence arise the impor-

*Form of Govt. ch. x. § 1.

tance and usefulness of presbyterial and synodical assemblies.'

Each of these bodies possesses certain sovereign and independent rights, under the constitution, with which the others cannot interfere. In our synods, and the states over which they usually preside, we have complete presbyterian republics ; so that were they in any case to become independent of all the rest, as they may at any moment, they would not be found wanting in any principle of presbyterianism. How perfect the analogy to our several states in the civil commonwealth. But as those states have found it to be for their individual interests, and the general prosperity of the country, to form that confederation which constitutes the government of the United States ; so have our several synods been led, by the strong impulse of christian union, to constitute the general assembly. This body represents all the particular churches of the denomination, and constitutes the bond of union, peace, correspondence, and mutual confidence among all our churches. Like the federal government, it is clothed with all the powers necessary to represent and carry out the interests of each synod, and the conduct of those affairs which cannot be administered so well by the synods separately, and which regard the united interests of all the churches, presbyteries, and synods. The cause of missions, foreign and domestic, and the publication of such works as are of general utility and importance, are thus intrusted in a special manner, to the wise conduct of this general assembly. And just as congress is not restricted from any constructive assumption of power, which is essential to the complete enjoyment and exercise of that which is *formally given*, and to the furtherance of the beneficent ends of the government,*

* Kent's Comment. vol. i. p. 214. ' A government too restricted for the due performance of its high trusts, will either become insignificant or be driven to usurpation.' Ibid. The want of this was the cause of the weakness of the confederation.

so has our assembly felt justly authorized to create boards or agencies, for the efficient discharge of its high duties in evangelizing our own country and the heathen world. Laws and regulations whose force and operation are to continue, are made in a little time, and hence there is no necessity for the legislative body to be always in session.* But since these regulations need perpetual execution and attendance, therefore it is necessary that there should be a power always in being, which may carry out the laws when made. And hence is the executive separated from the legislative power in our republic.† Now, in perfect correspondence with these established principles, the executive power, in carrying out all its designs, is committed by our general assembly to its several boards, which are, in fact, so many executive committees. And as the legislature cannot always foresee and provide for all that may be useful to the country, and the executive is empowered to make use of its power for the public good, even in cases for which the law has made no special provision, until the legislature can assemble and provide for the occasion;‡ so also are these boards or committees necessarily empowered to take all measures which are required, in order to carry out the objects intrusted to them, under a responsibility always to the general assembly.

Again, as the judiciary is appointed to pass upon any action of any member of the confederacy, which seems to be contrary to the laws of the union; so have we in our written constitution, and the power there secured to our presbyteries to decide by a majority against any usurpation of authority on the part of the assembly—our judiciary.

Further, in the government of the United States, an

* Locke on Govt. ch. xii. § 143 and § 153.

† See *ibid*, ch. xii. § 144 and § 153.

‡ *Ibid*, ch. xiv. § 159–161.

ultimate arbiter of interpretation is provided in the supreme court. And thus also in our church we have the general assembly, a court composed of delegates from all portions of the church, and which, in all cases of doubtful disputation as to the true meaning and intent of the constitution, is empowered to give an authorized exposition of the law, which becomes binding on the whole church, unless rejected by the contrary decision of a majority of all its presbyteries, that is, by the people, speaking through these primary assemblies. Although, therefore, our general assembly has great legislative power, yet it has no executive power. Its laws go down to our synods, presbyteries, and churches, to be executed by them; and, should they imply any thing arbitrary or unconstitutional, their force may there be at once stayed, as by so many breakwaters, against the power of tyranny.

SECTION IX.

Presbytery republican in several other particulars, with testimonies in its favor.

The analogy, therefore, between our ecclesiastical assemblies and those of the republic, is as complete as, in the nature of things, it could be. Were it necessary it might be still further enlarged. We will only briefly allude to some other particulars. Each house of civil representatives is sole judge of the election return, and of the qualifications of its members;* and so is it with our assembly. The house of representatives choose their own speaker;† and so do our assemblies elect their moderator. The proceedings of all our civil assemblies are public;‡ so are those of our ecclesiastical courts.

* Kent, i. 234.

† Ibid, p. 237.

‡ Ibid, p. 237, 238.

None of the officers or members of our civil legislatures are inviolable ; neither are there any privileged members or classes among us, who are either above the law, or screened from its attack.* The members of all our civil assemblies are equally delegated by the people, and represent them ; and so are the members of every ecclesiastical body. Each state puts faith in the acts of every other state ; and so does every ecclesiastical assembly in the acts of every other. Just as new states are admitted to the union, so are new synods received into our ecclesiastical confederation. As each several state elects its governor annually, so does every synod and assembly annually appoint its presiding head.

The following testimony to this republican character of our form of government, though given by an enemy, and designed to imply censure, is a reluctant admission of the truth in the case. ‘ Yet,’ says bishop Hughes,† ‘ though it is my privilege to regard the authority exercised by the general assembly as usurpation,‡ still I must say, with every man acquainted with the mode in which it is organized, that, for the purposes of popular and political government, *its structure is little* inferior to that of the congress itself. In any emergency that may arise, the general assembly can produce a uniformity among its adherents to the furthest boundaries of the land. It acts on the principle of a radiating centre, and is WITHOUT AN EQUAL OR A RIVAL among the other denominations of the country.’§ ‘ Here,’ to use the words of Alexander Henderson,|| ‘ there is a superiority without tyranny, for no

* Kent, i. p. 258.

† Breckinridge and Hughes’s Discussion, p. 80.

‡ We know that laymen never vote in Romish councils. This is a presbyterian heresy.

§ How king James and all the arbitrary kings of England dreaded our general assemblies, and their influence, in producing a spirit of liberty, we know. See Lect. on the Headship of Christ, pp. 66, 70, 80. See p. 13.

|| See in Lorimer’s Manual of Presbytery, p. 257.

minister hath a papal or monarchical jurisdiction over his own flock, far less over other pastors, and over all the congregations of a large diocese. Here, then, is parity without confusion and disorder, for the pastors are in order before the elders, and the elders before the deacons; every particular church is subordinate to the presbytery, the presbytery to the synod, and the synod to the national assembly. One pastor, also, hath priority of esteem before another for age, for zeal, for gifts, for good deservings of the church, each one honoring him whom God hath honored, and as he beareth the image of God, which was to be seen amongst the apostles themselves. But none hath præeminence of title, or power, or jurisdiction above others; even as in nature one eye hath not power over another, only the head hath power over all, even as Christ over his church. And, lastly, here there is a subjection without slavery, for the people are subject to the pastors and assemblies; yet there is no assembly wherein every particular church hath not interest and power, nor is there any thing done but they are, if not actually, yet virtually, called to consent unto it.'

Such is the correspondence between the doctrines of our church, our ministry, our eldership, our ecclesiastical assemblies, and the essential principles and characteristic outlines of this great and free commonwealth. From the delineation we have given of our system, we may challenge the inquirer, to bring it to the test of every principle which we have laid down as a constituent element in republicanism. Sure we are that no discordance will be found between the two, when fairly considered; but a most entire and perfect similarity.

SECTION X.

Presbytery republican in its creeds; in its protection of minoritics; in the framing of its laws; in its universal suffrage; and in its simplicity and opposition to all unnecessary forms.

Let us, however, call attention to a few additional points, in which the analogy will be as strikingly manifest.

Presbyterians are attached to creeds; that is, they believe that certain great truths and principles in religion must be fixed, certain, and established. But this is not inconsistent, as is ignorantly affirmed, with the spirit of republicanism, but is, on the contrary, necessary to true freedom. 'Obviously,' says 'Tocqueville,* 'without such common belief no society can prosper; say rather, no society does subsist; for without ideas held in common, there is no common action, and without common action there may still be men, but there is no social body. In order that society should exist, and, *a fortiori*, that a society should prosper, it is required that all the minds of the citizens should be rallied, and held together by certain prominent ideas; and this cannot be the case, unless each of them sometimes draws his opinion from the common source, and consents to accept certain matters of belief at the hands of the community. The public has, therefore, among a democratic people, a singular power, of which aristocratic nations could never so much as conceive an idea; for it does not persuade to certain opinions, but it enforces them, and infuses them into the faculties, by a sort of enormous pressure of the minds of all upon the reason of each. In the United States the ma-

* Vol. ii. p. 7. See also pp. 8-10.

majority undertakes to supply a multitude of ready-made opinions for the use of individuals, who are thus relieved from the necessity of forming opinions of their own. Every body, then, adopts great numbers of theories on philosophy, morals, and politics, without inquiry upon public trust.'

Such established opinions are the *common law* of the land and of the church. In both, alike, they protect the minority from that capricious tyranny of the democracy, which otherwise would oppress them. In both cases, also, these fundamental principles are embodied in the public constitutions, and are thus, in a measure, immutable and fixed.

Again, in the republic, power is determined by numbers, and yet even the minority are protected by the charter of the constitution; and so in our church the same principle prevails, since it is fundamental to our compact, that the majority shall be ruled by the constitution, and all by the Bible. We have one law, and one interpretation of the law.*

* See Dr. Junkins's Inaugural Address, p. 39. To such a political creed, and to its noble defence by an oppressed and persecuted minority, we owe our present liberties. 'In the times of Charles, a band of independent and public-spirited men were raised up. Their aim was to recover the nation's forgotten liberties and privileges. And in what manner did they act? They fell back upon the CONSTITUTION of the country; they had recourse to statutes and acts which were declared to be perpetual; and these they plead in opposition to all succeeding innovations. There was an old record on which the dust of years had gathered; this they brought from its resting-place; they studied the provisions of Magna Charta, and for these provisions they determined to contend, and to contend for them on the ground that they were embodied in this charter, which defined the country's constitution. The authority of this record they maintained against all contrary changes. Charles could plead precedents and long-continued usage, and the authority of judges, in support of many of his measures. Yet Hampden, and Pym, and Hollis, resisted these measures, and the ground of their resistance was, that these measures were contrary to the provisions of Magna Charta. Charles had the authority of his law-courts for the measure which he pressed, but these men set the authority of the constitution against the authority of the law-courts, and one of the leading grievances of which they complained was this, '*the judgment of lawyers against our liberty.*'

It is another essential principle of all true liberty, that no man should be bound by laws, canons, or decrees, over which, in their origination, and in their continuance, he has no control, by himself, or his legal representative. And, hence, in England, the canons of 1603 have never been recognised in law as binding upon the laity, because they were not represented in the convocation by which they were passed.* Now this, also, is the law of our church. To no rule or canon is any part of the clergy or laity required to pay respect, which has not been confirmed by their assent, either given in person, or by their delegated representatives. As thus securing in all their amplitude, the rights of all its members, the constitutional bulwarks of our church, stand as a proud monument on which their liberties are inscribed, and which pledge them to be free, and to hold the equal, universal, civil, and religious rights of all other men, denominations, and people.† .

Universal suffrage in the choice of its legislators is also considered a prominent feature of republicanism; and universal suffrage amongst communicants, in the choice of their clergy, is equally necessary to ecclesiastical republicanism. But this principle, we have seen, is fundamental to our system, and one for which the church of Scotland is, at this moment, willing to run the hazard of the most imminent peril and loss.‡ Our system consti-

* White's Mem. of Prot. Ep. Ch. p. 78.

† Breckinridge and Hughes's Discussion, p. 146.

‡ The Scotch church has declared herself republican, in the ecclesiastical sense, insisting upon universal suffrage amongst communicants in the choice of the clergy. If the movement party in Scotland is maintaining the right of election for the people—that in England is demanding it for the bishops. The electoral rights of the people are never mentioned in the Oxford conclave. There, they treat only of the rights of the successors of the apostles, which protestantism has invaded and catholicism is determined to restore. Here the two churches are directly opposed. They are the ecclesiastical counterparts of radicals and tories—the radicals being the Scotch and the tories the English divines. In perfect harmony with this distinctive

tutes the people umpires in determining the comparative merits of preachers, and in deciding who shall rule over them. It is a system worked by popular power, which bestows a kind of franchise on all who become parties to it, and which is, therefore, dependent upon popular intelligence. There must, therefore, as in the republic, be *some* limits to the exercise of this franchise; and this is found in the qualifications laid down for membership in the church, and which imply such a measure of discernment and goodness, as is necessary to the exercise of that franchise, and to the privileges of this 'holy and equal aristocracy.'*

Simplicity, and an opposition to all unnecessary forms and external observances is, we have found, another principle of republicanism. Nothing is more repugnant to it, than a subjection to forms — nothing more unimpressive, than ceremonial observances. That religion, therefore, which hopes to amalgamate and to become identified with a republican form of government, must assume few external observances, and vulgar, superstitious pageantry, dress, and show. 'I have shown,'† says Tocqueville, 'that nothing is more repugnant to the human mind, in an age of equality, than the idea of a subjection to forms. Men living at such times are impatient of figures; to their eyes symbols appear to be the puerile artifice which is used to

character, the Scotch divines are aiming at the most simple and unostentatious *finale* for their ecclesiastical reformation — *the simple preaching of the word!* The English regard the preaching as a matter of minor importance; considering rites and ceremonies, with ostentatious display in dresses, and plate, and statues, and pictures, and genuflexions, and music, as the primary, whilst preaching is only a secondary, subject of consideration. In other words, the Scotch are argumentative, and aim at the full establishment of a system which will encourage the exercise of judgment and criticism amongst the people, by constituting them judges of ministers, and umpires in determining the comparative merits of preachers and doctrines. *Letter from England, in N. Y. Journal of Commerce.*

* Milton. See Vaughan's Congreg. p. 11.

† Vol. ii. pp. 25, 26.

conceal or set off truths which should more naturally be bared to the light of open day ; they are unmoved by ceremonial observances, and they are predisposed to attach a secondary importance to the details of public worship. I firmly believe in the necessity of forms which fix the human mind in the contemplation of abstract truths, and stimulate its ardor in the pursuit of them, while they invigorate its power of retaining them steadfastly. Nor do I suppose that it is possible to maintain a religion without external observances ; but on the other hand, I am persuaded that in the ages upon which we are entering, it would be peculiarly dangerous to multiply them beyond measure ; and that they ought rather to be limited to as much as is absolutely necessary, to perpetuate the doctrine itself, which is the substance of religion of which the ritual is only the form. A religion which should become more minute, more peremptory, and more surcharged with small observances at a time in which men are becoming more equal, would soon find itself reduced to a band of fanatical zealots in the midst of an infidel people.' Now is not this a portraiture of the presbyterian church in contrast with prelatie and Romish churches ?

'The worship of the Lutherans,' says Mr. Villers,* 'and still more that of the Calvinists, is simple and strict. A stone, a cloth, form the altar ; a pulpit and benches are all the decorations necessary to the temple. Here nothing is thought of but the gospel, and some divine songs on morality and the christian duties, sung by the congregation. All is devoid of ornament, pomp, and elegance. The priest is clothed in a modest black garment : no veneration of a saint or an angel, and still less of their images, is recommended to pious souls. It might be said, that this worship is melancholy and dry in comparison with that of the Catholics, if, indeed, an assembly of persons collected

* Villers on the Ref. p. 249.

to worship in common, can really correspond with the idea of melancholy. Nevertheless, it is certain, that this worship can elevate the soul, and tends to disenchant the imagination.'

And who can witness this form of presbyterian worship, which has been termed 'the undeflowered and unblemishable simplicity of the gospel,'* and which is the very embodiment of the republican spirit,—and then contrast it with that 'false-whited lawny resemblance of the gospel, like that air-born Helena in the fables, made by the sorcery of prelates,'† without feeling that these latter, by their caps and hoods, their gowns and surplices, their belts and ornaments, their rochets and scapulaires, their crosses and pictures, their dishes and censers, their little bells and big bells, their singing-boys and singing-girls, their train-bearers and worshippers, their bowings and crossings, their risings and sitting down, their kneelings and prostrations, their parading and genuflexions, and all the pride, pomp, and circumstance, which make up the sabbath desecration of our Romish temples, do actually, and in the experience of a large proportion of the worshippers, drive holiness out of living into lifeless things, and seduce men to the worship of the creature more than the creator, who is a Spirit, and to be worshipped only in spirit and in truth. Certain it is, that even Tocqueville positively affirms, of our republican form of government, that there is nothing 'hierarchical in its constitution ;'‡ and if, as he gives reason to believe, the gradual development of the principle of equality is now the law of providence,§ we may confidently hope either that other systems must conform to presbytery, or that presbytery will be finally triumphant.

* Milton's Wks. vol. i. p. 143.

† Milton. *ibid.*

‡ Vol. i. p. 73.

§ *Ibid.* p. 4.

SECTION XI.

Presbytery eminently republican in having originated and secured in this country the separation of religion from politics, and of the church from the state.

But there yet remains one most important feature in this wonderful analogy. The separation of religion from politics, and of the church from the state, are essential to the true development of both; to universal tolerance by the state of all religions in it, and of all religions by one another;—and therefore to all civil and religious liberty.* Such, as we have seen, was the original appointment of Christ, and such are the existing principles on which our church is founded.† It was to the controversies, originated by the Puritans, and carried on by those who extended their views, we owe whatever distinct separation has been made between the civil and ecclesiastical powers. Previous to that time ‘the clergy generally claimed their tithes by divine right.’ ‘In no long time after,’ says bishop Warburton, in his ‘Alliance,’ ‘the clergy, in general, gave up this claim.’ ‘And I think,’ says he, ‘the priest’s *divine right* to a tenth part, and the king’s *divine right* to the other nine, went out of fashion together. And thenceforward, the church and the crown agreed to claim their temporal rights from the laws of the land only.’‡

Indeed, all the efforts to attain this independence can be traced, by an uninterrupted chain, to the first reformers. ‘Luther,’ says Villers,§ ‘brought the Saxon church, in what relates to its internal government, to the democracy of the first age, and the hierarchy to a moderate system of

* See the Church Independent of the Civil Govt., and Tocquev. vol i. pp. 339, 340.

† See above, p.

‡ Wks. vol. vii. p. 225.

§ On the Ref. p. 97.

subordination. The churches which have followed Calvin, are still more democratically constituted. But the clergy no longer form a civil corporation in any of them. Some public marks of honor and deference, are the only privileges of the ministers; according to the words of their masters, they give unto Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, by rendering unto God that which they owe him.'

The independence of the church, and its entire separation from the civil government, was clearly perceived and taught by Calvin, though the age was not prepared to act upon it. 'But he,' says Calvin,* 'who knows how to distinguish between the body and the soul, between this present transitory life, and the future eternal one, will find no difficulty in understanding, that the spiritual kingdom of Christ, and civil government, are things very different and remote from each other. It is a Jewish folly, therefore, to seek and include the kingdom of Christ under the elements of this world.'

What Calvin taught, Calvinists were the first to practice. Look at our standards, as they have been already brought to view.† How full, how forcible, how earnest are they, in the proclamation of this great truth. But these views, it may be said, are mere hypocritical pretence. On the contrary, Dr. Miller has well said, 'presbyterians in this country would rather be persecuted by the state, than be in alliance with it.' But such sentiments, it may be alleged, were forced upon our church by the revolution, and the omnipotence of public opinion. On the contrary, they were embodied in our standards before the revolution, as the free and unforced sentiments of American presbyterians, and as the exponent of those principles, which nerved their arms, when, to a man, they were found fighting under the banner of independence.

* Instit. B. iv. ch. xx. vol. ii. p. 561.

† See Presbytery, and not Prelacy, B. iii. ch. v. and vi. and Conf. of Faith, ch. xxiii. and Form of Gov. Prel. Princ.

But after all, it may be urged, this is only boasting, and it must be affirmed, that since, by our constitution, any other principles are rendered nugatory, their proclamation by the presbyterian church was a matter of necessity, and not of choice.' But the very contrary can be proved to be the truth. PRESBYTERIANS FORCED UPON THE STATE THE DOCTRINE OF THE ENTIRE INDEPENDENCE BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND THE CIVIL POWER. PRESBYTERIANS FIRST PROCLAIMED THIS DOCTRINE ON THESE AMERICAN SHORES. PRESBYTERIANISM WAS OPPOSED BY EPISCOPACY, IN HER EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH THIS DOCTRINE, IN VIRGINIA. AND THE UNIVERSAL ESTABLISHMENT OF THIS DOCTRINE THROUGHOUT THESE UNITED STATES, AND IN THE CONSTITUTION, WAS THE RESULT OF THE MOVEMENT MADE BY PRESBYTERIANS.*

These positions can all be sustained by evidence, which is as unimpeachable as that which attests the progress of the revolution itself; and although the whole credit of this cause has been given to Jefferson, it can be shown, that as the apostate Julian plumed himself with feathers stolen from the wing of Christianity, so did this modern apostate pride himself in doctrines taught him by that very sect, which he afterwards 'hated, with a perfect hatred.'

The Rev. Dr. Lang, of New South Wales, who visited this country a few years since, and has given the result of his observation in a very interesting volume,† examined into this subject, and has published all the original documents, as procured from the Library of the State House in Richmond. As the result of his inquiries, he states,‡ that instead of the American clergy 'having been opposed to the voluntary system, as they are supposed to have been,

* The Presbyterians in Ireland opposed all establishments, in 1787. See the bishop of Cloyne on, in Lond. Christ. Obs. for 1838, p. 807.

† Religion and Education in America, by John Dunmore Lang, D. D. Lond. 1840.

‡ p. 92.

the fact is, that the original introduction of the voluntary system was wholly and solely the work of a numerous and influential portion of the American clergy themselves; and so far from the separation of the church and state having been carried with a high and revolutionary hand, over the influence and opposition of the sacerdotal order, through the mere political manœuvring of Mr. Jefferson, the fact is, that the legislature of Virginia, in which that important measure was originally carried, and through whose influence and example it was subsequently extended gradually over the whole union, was itself borne into it unwillingly, by the clerical pressure from without. In short, the history of the establishment of the voluntary system in America, affords one of the most remarkable instances of enlightened patriotism, and generous self-denial, to be found in the whole history of the church of Christ.

‘The first body of clergy,’* continues Dr. Lang, ‘of any denomination in America, that openly recognised the declaration of independence, and thereby identified themselves with the cause of freedom and independence, was the presbyterian clergy of Virginia.’ That body, which was then comparatively numerous and influential, constituting the large presbytery of Hanover, addressed the Virginia House of Assembly on the subject, at their first meeting after the declaration; and in the course of their memorial, after urging their own claim for entire religious freedom, recommended the establishment of the voluntary system, and the complete separation of church and state in Virginia. In this memorial our fathers employ the following language:†

‘In this enlightened age, and in a land where all, of every denomination, are united in the most strenuous efforts to be free, we hope and expect that our representatives

* Religion and Education in America, by John Dunmore Lang, D. D. Lond. 1840, p. 94.

† p. 96. See this Memorial given in *ibid*, at pp. 95 – 98.

will cheerfully concur in removing every species of religious as well as civil bondage. Certain it is, that every argument for civil liberty gains additional strength when applied to liberty in the concerns of religion; and there is no argument in favor of establishing the christian religion, but may be pleaded with equal propriety, for establishing the tenets of Mahommed, by those who believe the Alcoran; or, if this be not true, it is at least impossible for the magistrate to adjudge the right of preference among the various sects that profess the christian faith, without erecting a chain of infallibility, which would lead us back to the church of Rome.'

In the legislature, however, the policy of a general assessment for the support of religion, on such principles as would afford that support equally to all denominations, was much and earnestly discussed; and the subject was at length referred by the general assembly to the people, for the purpose of ascertaining their sentiments in regard to it. In consequence of this reference a memorial was presented to the assembly, by the presbytery of Hanover, in the year 1777. The Rev. Samuel S. Smith, and the Rev. David Rice, were the committee who framed it.*

Another memorial, equally strong, was presented by this same presbytery, in 1784;† expressing the uneasiness of their people, and in which they said, 'the security of our religious rights, upon equal and impartial ground, instead of being made a fundamental part of our constitution, as it ought to have been, is left to the precarious fate of common law. A matter of general and essential concern to the people, is now committed to the hazard of the prevailing opinion of a majority of the assembly, at its different sessions. . . We are willing to allow a full share of credit to our fellow-citizens, however distinguished in name from us, for their

* See this Memorial given in *ibid*, at pp. 99 – 102.

† See given at pp. 103 – 108.

spirited exertions in our arduous struggle for liberty; we would not wish to charge any of them, either ministers or people, with open disaffection to the common cause of America, or with crafty dissimulation or indecision, till the issue of the war was certain, so as to oppose their obtaining equal privileges in religion; but we will resolutely engage against any monopoly of the honors and rewards of government, by any one sect of christians, more than the rest, for we shun not a comparison with any of our brethren, for our efforts in the cause of our country, and assisting to establish her liberties, and therefore esteem it unreasonable that any of them should reap superior advantages, for at most but equal merit. We expect from the representatives of a free people, that all partiality and prejudice, on any account whatever, will be laid aside, and that the happiness of the citizens at large will be secured, upon the broad basis of perfect political equality. This will engage confidence in government, and unsuspicious affection toward our fellow-citizens.'

The act, however, having been passed by the legislature, and a proposal having been made for a general assessment, the presbytery again memorialized the assembly, in October, 1784.* In this paper, which breathes the very spirit of liberty, and of what is now boasted of as American freedom, it is, among other things, said, 'we hope no attempt will be made to point out articles of faith that are not essential to the peace of the society; or to settle modes of worship; or to interfere in the internal government of religious communities, or to render the ministers of religion independent of the will of the people, whom they serve. We expect from our representatives, that careful attention to the political equality of all the citizens, which a republic ought ever to cherish; and that no scheme of an assessment will be encouraged, which

* See the Memorial, in *ibid.*, at pp. 110 - 115.

will violate the happy privilege we now enjoy, of thinking for ourselves, in all cases where conscience is concerned. In the present important moment, we conceived it criminal to be silent; and have, therefore, attempted to discharge a duty which we owe to our religion, as christians; to ourselves, as freemen; and to our posterity, who ought to receive from us a precious birthright of perfect freedom and political equality.'

A bill to provide for the support of religion, on the principle of such an assessment, had actually been read a second time, and was engrossed for the third reading, when the memorial was presented. In consequence of that memorial, however, the third reading of the bill was postponed, with a view 'to the further consideration of the measure.' 'This,' observes Dr. Rice, 'gave an opportunity for such an expression of public sentiment as completely decided the matter.' A petition to the legislature was drawn up by the Rev. John B. Smith, the writer of the preceding memorial, remonstrating against the principle of an assessment for the support of religion, and soliciting the establishment of complete religious liberty, and the entire separation of church and state. This petition was signed by not fewer than TEN THOUSAND VIRGINIANS; the original document and the preceding memorial, being both in existence still, in the handwriting of Mr. Smith, in the office of the clerk of the House of Delegates of Virginia.

A convention of the presbyterian church in Virginia was also held, at which time, among other proceedings, another memorial was adopted, to be presented to the general assembly, or house of delegates, at its next meeting. It was given in charge for that purpose, to the Rev. John B. Smith, one of the ablest ministers of the American presbyterian church at the time, who not only

presented it in person, but was heard in support of it, for *three successive days*, at the bar of the house.*

The result of this long-continued agitation, on the part of the presbyterian clergy of Virginia, was, that the bill for the support of religion, by means of a general assessment, from which that body of clergy would have derived precisely the same pecuniary advantages as their episcopal brethren, was thrown out in the house of assembly, after it had passed the second reading, and been engrossed for the third. And, as all the acts of the British parliament, as well as all the enactments of the old colonial legislature, establishing the episcopal church in Virginia had, in the mean time, been repealed, the voluntary system became, thenceforward, the law of the land.

At the period in question, Virginia was the leading state of the south, if not of the whole Union. Its proceedings were carefully watched, and its example generally followed, by the smaller adjoining states of Maryland and Delaware on the one hand, and by the Carolinas and Georgia on the other. When, therefore, the new system, of leaving religion entirely to itself, had been duly tested, and found to work well in Virginia, it was successfully adopted by each of these states. And so general had the feeling in favor of that system become, almost immediately after its introduction, that when the Federal government was constituted, in the year 1789, one of the fundamental stipulations of its constitution was, that it should never have the power to erect an established church in the United States.

‘I have already observed,’ says Dr. Lang, ‘that in the little Baptist state of Rhode Island, as well as in the Quaker colony of Pennsylvania, there had been no church establishment from the first. But these communities had had comparatively no influence in this particular, on the

* See given in *ibid*, at pp. 118–122.

neighboring states. It was the struggle with powerful and opposing influences, for the establishment of a great moral principle in Virginia, that attracted general attention throughout the Union; it was the successful operation of that principle, when actually established, that carried conviction, and insured its universal adoption. It was long after the war of independence, and only in consequence of a series of hard struggles on the part of other communions, that the example of Virginia, in establishing the voluntary system, was acted upon in Massachusetts, and the old congregational establishment of that state entirely overthrown. And it is only ten years ago, or in the year 1830, after the voluntary system had been in operation for half a century in Virginia, and in most of the other states of the Union, that it was at length fully established in Massachusetts, and an *entire* separation effected, throughout the Union, between church and state.*

It is a fact also worthy of consideration,† that when the assembly which framed the Cambridge platform, in 1660, adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith, they made no exception of those clauses which relate to the power of civil magistrates in matters of religion, while they did except those parts ‘which have respect unto church government and discipline.’ Whereas, our synod, in adopting the same formula in 1729, made no objection to what related to church government; while they objected to what referred to the power of civil magistrates.

Such are the facts in the case — facts, clear and indubitable, as any other facts in our whole history. They put to silence the slanderous imputations of our foes. They demonstrate the innate, hearty, and resolute republicanism of presbytery. And they prove beyond contradiction, that the analogy which we have now traced between

* Bib. Repertory, July, 1840, p. 334.

† Such is the judgment of Dr. Lang, himself, a European. *Relig. in America*, p. 308.

every essential principle of republicanism and the principles of presbyterianism, is not imaginary or fortuitous, but founded in the very nature of things.*

To conclude. The constitution of the presbyterian church, observes the late Dr. Rice, of Virginia, 'is fundamentally and decidedly republican; and it is in a very happy measure adapted to that particular modification of republican institutions, which prevails in the United States. This is too plain to require demonstration; the slightest attention being sufficient to convince any one that our ecclesiastical constitution establishes in the church a representative government. Hence, the more decidedly a man is a presbyterian, the more decidedly is he a republican. So much is this the case, that some christians of this society, fully believing that presbytery is *de jure divino*, consider this as decisive evidence that republicanism is of divine institution; and are persuaded that they should grievously sin against God by acknowledging any other form of civil government.†

* Dr. Lang, pp. 308, 309.

† Illustrations of the Char. and Conduct of the Presb. Ch. in Va. by John Holt Rice, D. D.

CHAPTER III.

THE REPUBLICANISM OF PRESBYTERY ATTESTED BY HISTORY.

SECTION I.

THE analogy which has been proved to exist, between republicanism and presbytery, may be fully attested, and therefore strengthened, by an appeal to history, as embodying the opinions of men in different ages, concerning presbytery, and its actual working as a system.

For the first three hundred years, the christian church was essentially presbyterian, and as certainly republican in its form of government. The original form in which christianity existed in Ireland and in Scotland, was, as has been fully established, presbyterian.* Nothing could be more perfectly analogous in all fundamental principles, than the system of the ancient Culdees — the primitive christians of Ireland, of Scotland, and ultimately of England also — and presbyterianism. Now among the charges made against the Culdees, by their inveterate enemies, the Romanists, were these, ‘their exclusive devotedness to the authority of scripture, their rejection of the Romish ceremonies, doctrines, and traditions, the nakedness of their forms of worship, and THE REPUBLICAN CHARACTER OF THEIR ECCLESIASTICAL GOVERNMENT.’†

* See the proof of this, in the author’s *Presbytery and not Prelacy the Primitive and Scriptural Polity*. B. iii. ch. ii. § 8–10.

† *Pictorial Hist. of England*, vol. i. p. 245. B. ii. ch. ii.

SECTION II.

The form of government among the Waldenses, who have always been thorough presbyterians, was as purely republican.*

We have also noticed the existence, during succeeding centuries, of various individuals and bodies, who advocated the doctrines of presbytery, and who raised their loud protest against the encroachments of spiritual and civil despotism. Among these, one of the most remarkable was Arnold, of Brescia, who, in the twelfth century, stood forth as a most daring opponent of clerical ambition, and of all oppression. Arnold commenced his stormy career, as a preacher, in the streets of Brescia. The kingdom of Christ† he ventured to describe as not of this world; secular honors and possessions, he also dared to maintain, could justly belong only to the laity. On the total relinquishment of such anti-christian appendages, by every gradation of ecclesiastics, he loudly insisted as being the claim of the gospel, and as essential to their salvation, even to that of their accredited head. His followers at length fixed upon the desperate resolve, to unfurl the standard of revolt in the very city of Rome. ‘Familiar alike,’ says Dr. Vaughan,‡ ‘with the civil and religious history of Rome, Arnold dwelt with a commanding eloquence on the exploits of the Bruti, the Gracchi, and the Scipio’s, and on the saintly character of the martyrs who had perished in the cause of her ancient and her better christianity. With a glow of patriotism, and we must presume of piety too, he urged the restoration of the forgotten laws of the republic, and required, as a measure strictly essential to produce a return of the purity and the triumphs of

* See Presbytery and not Prelacy, &c. as above. B. iii. ch. iii. § 5.

† Vaughan’s Life of Wickliffe, vol. i. p. 139.

‡ Ibid, p. 140.

religion, that all authority in the pontiffs and the clergy should be limited to the spiritual government of the christian commonwealth.' 'In Rome, for nearly ten years, the influence of the monk of Brescia presided, while several contemporary pontiffs trembled within its walls, sunk beneath the cares of their tottering empire, or resorted as exiles to the adjacent cities. It was long, however, since the voice of freedom had echoed among the seven hills; and her authority, in the present instance, was precarious, and of short duration.'*

Pope Adrian accused Arnold to the emperor, when he labored to show that the heresy of Arnold was not less hostile to political, than to ecclesiastical government. It is unnecessary to add, that he was soon commended to the tender mercies of the fagot, having perished at the stake in 1155. His influence, however, did not die with him. For, being driven in his exile to Zurich, he is presumed to have left the seeds of his doctrine to vegetate there, until, in the age of Zuinglius, it sprung up in the harvest of the reformation.

Wickliffe was, we have seen,† the reviver of presbyterian principles in England; — and was he not, also, the great champion of civil and religious liberty? 'In English history,‡ Wickliffe is known as the first man who dared to advocate the free circulation of the scriptures in the vernacular tongue, the unalienable right of private judgment, and our complete deliverance from the wiles and oppressions of a papal priesthood.' 'And to his mind nearly every principle of our general protestantism may be distinctly traced.' This will be manifest to any one who will investigate the doctrines of Wickliffe, respecting the pope's temporal power; the secular exemptions of the clergy; the limits to the authority of the magistrate; the

* Vaughan's Life of Wickliffe, vol. i. p. 140.

† Presbytery and not Prelacy the Script. and Primit. Polity. B. iii.

‡ Vaughan, *ibid*, p. 8.

customs of patronage; tithes and ecclesiastical endowments; and other similar matters.* The Lollards, who were the followers of Wickliffe, adopted his principles, and by their opposition to the usurpations and tyranny of both church and state, paved the way for the English reformation; and for the present liberties of the English nation.

The principles of Wickliffe were also adopted† by Huss, who undauntedly declaimed against the clergy, the cardinals, the pope himself, and against all despotism, whether in church or state. He therefore taught,‡ that a 'prelate is no prelate, while he is in mortal sin; that a bishop is no bishop, while he is in mortal sin; and that if temporal lords do wrongs and extortions to the people, they ben traytors to God and his people, and tyrants of antichrist.' And Huss corroborated this opinion, by showing that it was held by St. Austin. For these labors, Wickliffe, Huss, and Jerome, of Prague, have been immortalized by Dryden. Of 'this great triumvirate,' he gives, as their common characteristic, an 'innate antipathy to kings.'§ It thus appears, that as the love of liberty has been ever considered the peculiarity of the Teutonic race,|| so has this spirit unfolded itself in a uniform resistance to spiritual as well as civil despotism.

* See Vaughan's Life, vol. ii. ch. viii. p. 226, &c.

† See Prelacy and not Presbytery, &c. as above. B. iii.

‡ Middleton's Evang. Biog. vol. i. p. 36.

§ Poet. Works, (Hind & Panther,) vol. ii. p. 24.

|| Mackintosh's Hist. of Eng. vol. i. p. 10.

SECTION III.

The republicanism of presbytery fully developed by the reformation.

The reformation was an outburst of liberty against the priestcraft of Rome, and the civil bondage it had engendered.* It was a general emancipation of the human mind. The lightning spirit of liberty, which had been pent up for ages, now rent the heavens, renewed the face of society, and restored vitality to every department of human knowledge. It shook, as has been said, the seven hills; it broke the yoke of antichrist; it shivered the sword of the oppressor; it smote the shrine of superstition; it rent the garments from the shoulders of the Roman harlot; it awoke the consciences of men; it fixed a proper value upon man's soul; it enlightened Europe; it made error and ignorance a scandal and a curse.† It unclasped the long-closed volume of divine inspiration. It thus put into every man's hand the standard of truth, and the touchstone of error. It made men once more hear the voice of God, and learn his truth directly from his own lips; not distorted, transmuted, concealed, falsified, by popes, priests, breviaries, or missals; nor wrapped up in a foreign tongue, as if to muffle or silence the voice of heaven! It set free the fettered ministry which Christ had ordained in his church. It unloosed their bonds; and

* Speaking of Luther's appearance in the Hall of the Diet at Worms, Carlyle (Lect. on Heroes, p. 218, Eng. ed.) says, 'The people on the morrow, as he went up to the hall of the diet, crowded the windows and housetops, some of them calling out to him, in solemn words, not to recant. 'Whosoever denieth me before men!' they cried to him,—as in a kind of solemn petition and adjuration. Was it not in reality, our petition too, the petition of the whole world, lying in dark bondage of soul, paralysed under a black spectral night-mare, and tripple-hatted chimera, calling itself Father in God, and what not.' 'Free us; it rests with thee; desert us not!' 'Luther did not desert us.'

† See Presb. Rev. 1842, p. 33, and Brooke's Hist. of Rel. Lib. vol. i. pp. 208, 210, 211.

while stripping them of their idle trappings, and degrading them from the false exaltation which they had occupied, it elevated them to their true dignity and office, as ambassadors for Christ, and heralds of the great salvation. It taught men to disown them as priests, sacrificers, incense-burners, forgivers of sins, mediators ; but it called on men to listen with most earnest and reverent heed to them, as witnesses of the one glorious high priest — proclaimers of the one perfect sacrifice.' It has also restored man's true responsibility to God, and with it man's true dignity and worth, both in his own eyes, and in the eyes of his fellow-men. The object of popery was, to supplant personal, by clerical or rather ecclesiastical responsibility, and thereby it exalted itself, and its priests, to a superhuman lordship over men's souls, and drew to itself a power, which it wielded, with merciless cruelty, over its blinded votaries, thus brought within its grasp, and laid entirely at its mercy.

The gospel was thus brought, in all its original simplicity and glorious liberty, into contact with the minds and hearts of men. But 'christianity,' to use the words of Warburton,* 'naturally inspires the love, both of civil and religious liberty ; it raises the desire of being governed by *laws* of our own making, and by the *conscience* which is of God's own giving. Either the foul spirit of tyranny will defile the purity of religion, and introduce the blind submission of the understanding, and slavish compliance of the will in the church ; or else the spirit of the Lord will overturn the usurpation of an unjust, despotic power, and bring into the state, as well as the church, a free and reasonable service.'

So it was at the era of the reformation. Civil and ecclesiastical tyranny were so united in their principles and administration, that when the mind was emancipated

* In Brooks's Hist. of Relig. Lib. vol. i. p. 181.

from the bondage of the latter, it was at the same time prepared to resist the former, and to reject, as absurd, the long-established doctrines, of the divine right of kings to rule independently of their people, and of passive obedience and non-resistance to their will. The civil powers had become completely subjugated to the ecclesiastical. 'Moreover,' says Luther, 'the pope and clergy were all in all, over all and every thing, like God himself in the world; and the civil authority was in darkness, oppressed, and misunderstood.' When, therefore, the people, to whom the reformers every where appealed, were led to investigate the grounds of this ecclesiastical tyranny, they were also led to inquire into the first authority by which kings were made. They were thus necessarily brought to see the true rights of the people, and the dependence of all magistrates upon *their* sovereign authority, and the power delegated by them.* And it is, in fact, to the religious spirit excited during the sixteenth century, which spread rapidly through Europe, and diffused itself among all classes of men, that we are chiefly indebted for the propagation of the genuine principles of rational liberty, and the consequent amelioration of government. In effecting that memorable revolution, by their instructions and exhortations, the teachers of protestant doctrine roused the people to consider their rights, and exert their power; they stimulated timid and wary politicians; they encouraged and animated princes, nobles, and confederated states, with their armies, against the most formidable opposition, and under the most overwhelming difficulties, until their exertions were ultimately crowned with success.†

Royalty, wherever it existed, stood in the way of the reformation of the church, and hence the blows aimed at

* See Villers on Ref. pp. 108, 109, 110, 183.

† McCrie's Life of Knox, vol. i. pp. 301, 302.

the abuses of the church, necessarily passed through the sides of regal power, and led men to seek that form of government, by which such obstructions to civil and religious liberty would be removed.* Hence those works to which it gave birth, and which are, to this day, the textbooks of freedom.† Hence, also, those secret societies, which were every where established, and of which ‘the principles of equality and fraternity between the members,’ were essential elements.‡

Those states, therefore, which possessed a republican form of government, were the first to raise the standard of revolt; the most bold in challenging the authority of the papacy; and the least corrupted by its superstitious rites and ceremonies.§ The Swiss republics first came forward, by their patriotic devotion, to teach men their

* It has been a standing subject of railing accusation against the reformers, that they abetted the doctrine of defensive arms, &c. See authorities in Jameson’s *Cyp. Isot.* pp. 211, 212.

† ‘Luther,’ says Villers, (on the Reformation, p. 220, &c.) ‘wrote his *Treatise of the Civil Magistrate*, his *Appeal to the German Nobility*, &c. Melanethon, Zuingle, John Stourm, and other reformers, discussed similar subjects, and brought them within the reach of the less informed. Buchanan published his famous and bold libel, *De Jure Regni*, in Scotland; while on the continent, Hubert Languet wrote his *Vindiciæ contra tyrannos*, and Elienne de la Bœti, his *Discours sur la servitude volontaire*. Milton, who labored to defend the long parliament of England, and to justify the punishment of Charles I, to the human race; composed several political books, which breathed the most ardent republicanism, and among others, his *Defence of the People of England*, against *Laumaise*.’

‘It was reserved for the immortal *Grotius*, to carry light into the midst of darkness, to class and arrange the principles, and to offer to Europe the first book in which the rights and duties of men in society were laid down with energy, precision, and wisdom.’

‘After *Grotius*, I shall speak of his rival *Selden*, of his commentator *Bæcler*, of *Puffendorf*, who published a *Law of Nature*, superior, perhaps, to the *Law of Peare*, of *Barbeyrac*, the able translator, and *Aristarchus*, of these two works. *Hobbes*, however, in England, supporting another system, was not less useful to the science, both by the truths which he published, and by the refutations which he provoked against him. *Algernon Sydney* followed the opposite principles to those of *Hobbes*, in his *Treatise on Government*, and died a martyr to his attachment to the cause of the people.’

‡ Villers on the Ref. p. 264,

§ *Ibid*, p. 46,

rights, and to encourage modern Europe to believe what is related of the courage of the Spartans at Thermopylæ, and of their virtues in Laconia.* It may also be affirmed, that the spirit of the reformation† led to the establishment of the republican form of government, in countries where it had never before existed, and that to it, as the remote cause, is the American revolution to be itself attributed.‡ ‘The most accurate observers,’ says Villers,§ ‘have noticed, that nature has particularly fitted the people of the north to be republicans; and it cannot be denied, that several of those who have embraced the reformation, have always been actuated by this spirit, as, for example, the Saxons, the Swiss, the Dutch, and the English; it may even be said, that the reformation itself was only a positive application of it. This shock, in its turn, awakened all the energy, and the accessory ideas of it. The will to be free, in matters of conscience, is at the bottom the same as the will to be free in civil matters. Now this will can accomplish all that is required; so there are no slaves, but those who wish to be so, or who have not the strength of will to put an end to it. The energy of men’s minds at length constitutes true liberty, as their effeminacy makes tyranny necessary. The calm and sober sentiment of the high dignity of man, is the only solid foundation of true republicanism; it is by it alone, that equality of rights, and reciprocity of duties, are established. Christianity, in the purity of its essence, inspires this sentiment, for which reason, it is very common and general, in the evangelical countries.’

* Villers on the Reformation, p. 42.

† ‘Now the protestant reformation,’ says Bancroft, (*Hist. of United States*, vol. ii. p. 456, et seq. and p. 459,) ‘considered in its largest influence on politics, was the common people awakening to freedom of mind.’ Not unimportant in this bearing, is the testimony of Gibbon, who says, (*Decl. and Fall*, vol. ii. p. 332, note, 8vo ed.) ‘after we have passed the difficulties of the first century, we find the episcopal government universally established, till it was interrupted by the republican genius of the Swiss and German reformers.’

‡ See *ibid.* p. 113, and Carlyle’s *Lect. on Heroes*, p. 219, Eng. ed.

§ *Ibid.* p. 106.

Thus it was in the low countries. At the time of the reformation, they were subject to Spain. But the spirit of the reformation had introduced its ally, the spirit of liberty, among them. The United Provinces threw off the yoke of Philip II, with courage; and founded, in their morasses, a confederation very nearly resembling that which had been formed on the mountains of Helvetia.*

Still more wonderful was the republican influence of the reformation, as exhibited in Geneva. Geneva, as has been said, was little known before the reformation of the sixteenth century. Subjected alternately by bishops and counts, who disputed the dominion; divided into parties, according to the passions and interests of the moment, this city exerted no influence abroad. To protestantism, and to Calvin, she owes her celebrity and greatness. Calvin was not only a theologian of the first order; he was also a politician of astonishing sagacity, and Montesquieu had reason to say, that Geneva ought to celebrate, with gratitude, the day when Calvin came within her walls.† Morals then became pure; the laws of the state underwent a thorough change, and the organization of the church was based upon the soundest principles. Geneva received the reformed doctrines from Zuingle. Now while Luther had restored to the people their Bible, Zuingle restored to them their rights. Its popular aspect was the characteristic of the reformation in Switzerland. And hence the very first fruit of the reform, as thus given to Geneva, was its liberty.‡ It expelled

*Villers, p. 71, and more fully at p. 136, &c. The present republican constitution of Hamburgh, and the other free cities of Europe, originated in the principles of the Reformation. Baird's Visit to Northern Europe, vol. i. p. 82-83.

†D'Aubigne's Hist of the Ref. vol iii. p. 320, 'The maintenance of sound doctrine was intrusted to the people, and recent events have shown, that the people can discharge the trust, better than priests or pontiffs.'

‡Villers on the Ref. p. 133. 'The era of its reformation, was that also of the establishment of its liberty.' Scott's Contin. of Milner, vol. iii. p. 256.

its prince bishop, and afterwards governed itself for almost three centuries.* When the duke of Savoy required them to take back their bishop, and restore popery; the council replied, 'that they were resolved to sacrifice their property, their distinctions, their very children, and their own lives, for the word of God; and that they would rather, with their own hands, set fire to the four corners of the city, than part with so precious and sacred a treasure for themselves, and their families.'†

Now for the cultivation of this spirit, the Genevans were indebted to Calvin, who entirely concurred with Zuingli in placing power in the hands of the people, and in his love for republicanism. Calvin openly avowed his republican views. 'Indeed,' says he,‡ 'if these three forms of government, which are stated by philosophers, be considered in themselves, I shall by no means deny, that either aristocracy, or a mixture of aristocracy and democracy, far excels all others; and that, indeed, not of itself, but because it very rarely happens, that kings regulate themselves, so that their will is never at variance with justice and rectitude; or in the next place, that they are endued with such penetration and prudence, as in all cases to discover what is best. The vice or imperfection of men, therefore, renders it safer, and more tolerable, for the government to be in the hands of many, that they may afford each other mutual assistance, and admonition, and that if any one arrogate to himself more than is right, the many may act as censors, and masters, to

* The effects of Calvin's republicanism 'after the lapse of ages, are still visible in the industry and intellectual tone of Geneva.' 'The effects of the reformation,' continues the author of *History of Switzerland*, Lond. 1832, p. 227, 'made themselves manifest in all the relations of public and private life; general attention was directed to the internal wants and welfare of the country; and the rising generation acquired a taste for the arts of peace, and for the sciences, by which the mind is most enlarged and elevated. The study of the ancients, and of history, had been revived by theological inquirers.'

† Scott's *Contin. of Milner*, vol. iii. p. 288.

‡ *Instit. B.* iv. c. 20, § 8, vol. ii. pp. 566, 567.

restrain his ambition. This has always been proved by experience, and the Lord confirmed it by his authority, when he established a government of this kind among the people of Israel, with a view to preserve them in the most desirable condition, till he exhibited, in David, a type of Christ. And as I readily acknowledge, that no kind of government is more happy than this, where liberty is regulated with becoming moderation, and properly established on a durable basis, so also I consider those as the most happy people, who are permitted to enjoy such a condition; and if they exert their strenuous and constant efforts for its preservation, I admit, that they act in perfect consistence with their duty.'

'Calvin,' says bishop Horsley,* 'was unquestionably, in theory, a republican; he freely declares his opinion, that the republican form, or an aristocracy reduced nearly to the level of a republic, was of all the best calculated, in general, to answer the ends of government. So wedded indeed, was he to this notion, that, in disregard of an apostolic institution, and the example of the primitive ages, he endeavored to fashion the government of all the protestant churches upon republican principles; and his persevering zeal in that attempt, though in this country, through the mercy of God it failed, was followed, upon the whole, with a wide and mischievous success. But in civil politics, though a republican in theory, he was no leveller.'

The influence of this small Genevan democracy, replete with knowledge, patriotism, and activity, particularly on France, England, and 'Russia was,' says Mr. Villers, 'incalculable.'† It was to Geneva, that all the proscribed exiles, who were driven from England by the

* Sermons, p. 553, App. to Sermon 44.

† Villers on the Ref. pp. 123, 134. Sir Egerton Brydges, in his life of Milton, p. 78, says, 'they were not content with forming a republican government for their own petty canton, but struggled to turn all the great monarchies into republics.'

intolerance of Mary, 'came to get intoxicated with republicanism,' and from this focus they brought back with them, on their return from exile, those principles of republicanism, which annoyed Elizabeth, perplexed and resisted James, and brought Charles to the deserved death of a traitor.*

No small part of the enmity of many European monarchs to the reformation, originated in their fear of its republican tendencies. There existed on the continent of Europe a general suspicion, that protestantism was hostile to the existing forms of civil government, which seemed to derive confirmation from the events which took place in Scotland, Bohemia, the Netherlands, and England, successively. This suspicion, the popes industriously fostered, and made abundant use of it in France, Bavaria, and Austria, where the civil power coöperated with them, influenced, as Ranke considers, by a feeling that its own security was endangered by the principles of the reformation. 'It is asserted,' says M. Villers,† 'that, at first, Francis I, appeared very favorable to the doctrine of the reformers of the church. His beloved sister, Margaret, queen of Navarre, protected it publicly. At that instant, the fate of the kingdom depended on the party which he should embrace. If he had adopted the reform, all France would have followed his example; the fate of protestantism in Europe would have been sooner decided; the civil wars in France would doubtless not have taken place, nor would the revolution of the eighteenth century. Every thing assumed a contrary aspect, because the prince conceived lively apprehensions of the political consequences of the reformation. Brantome relates, that one day, in a conversation on this subject, the king accidentally said, 'that this novelty tended principally to the overthrow of monarchy, both

* See Villers on the Ref. and Taylor's Hist. Biog. of the age of Elizabeth, vol. ii. p. 13.

†Ibid, pp. 112, 113, and 179.

human and divine.' Thus it was, that, as it developed itself, the reformation armed the French monarchy against it. As it spread over the provinces of the south, it afforded a new principle for the basis of liberty, and it was joined speedily by malcontent nobles. In fact, in France, the Huguenot body soon made pretensions equivalent to a partition of the monarchy, and the contest was purely a civil one. As for orthodoxy, the French court seems never to have cared many straws about it.

It cannot be doubted, that the sovereigns were made thoughtful at an early period, by the democratic tendency of institutions, which vested the government of churches in the body of christians. Early popular commotions in Germany, must have forced this on their attention. The emperor Charles was moved, through almost his whole life, by mere reasons of temporary policy. In the opening of his reign, he apprehended war with Francis I, of France; hence he tried to gain over the pope, by pretending to call Luther to account. Afterwards, when war had broken out between him and Clement VII, it is not wonderful that an emperor who could keep the pope prisoner, and order prayers to be publicly offered for his deliverance, should connive at the spread of the reformed principles. But when Charles found his reputation in all Europe to be endangered by his hypocritical profaneness, and it seemed to be his interest to conciliate the pope; then he assumed a show of orthodoxy, and declared his determination to suppress the new opinions. His haughty behaviour towards independent princes, (for such the German electors were,) led to the celebrated league of Smalkalde, in which those princes guaranteed to defend their honor, station, and liberty of conscience, against his unconstitutional and unjust encroachments. *But this was the crisis which decided the house of Austria, for ever after, to become the inveterate foes*

of protestantism. The league proved so powerful as to frighten and humble the emperor; who could then be satisfied with nothing, but to trample out every spark of the religion which had originated this formidable union.* Now to this confederation, we owe our present civil and religious liberties. If, as has been strikingly remarked, Germany had been a monarchy, strictly so called, the arbitrary will of the sovereign might have crushed the reformation. On the other hand, had it been a democracy, the cause would have been equally destroyed by the precipitation of the people. But inasmuch as it was a republican confederation, the cause of the reformation was equally protected against the hindrances of power, and the anarchy of a democratic populace.†

And hence, as the Roman catholic party every where fought for the royal authority against rebellious subjects, and the protestants fought in support of these same rebels, and for the foundation of a republic, it has been since received as an avowed and fundamental maxim of state, that catholicism is the best support of absolute power, while protestantism favored rebellion and a republican spirit. Nor is this maxim even at the present day relinquished by many statesmen.'

The spirit of the reformation had found its way, by some secret and mysterious process, to Scotland, and enkindled a flame of liberty in the enthusiastic bosom of John Knox, its illustrious reformer. His studies introduced him‡ to an acquaintance with the maxims and modes of government in the free states of antiquity; and it is reasonable to suppose, that his intercourse with the republics of Switzerland and Geneva had some influence on his political creed. Dr. McCrie admits, that his admiration of the polity of republics, was great,' though not

* Eclectic Review of Ranke's Popes, p 299.

† D'Aubigne's Hist. of the Ref. vol. i. pp. 83, 85, 90, Eng. ed

‡ McCrie in *ibid*, p. 303.

so indiscriminate 'as to prevent him from separating the essential principles of equity and freedom which they contained, from others which were incompatible with monarchy.'* He adds, however, that 'at this time, more just and enlarged sentiments were diffused through the nation, and the idea of a commonwealth, including the mass of the people, as well as the privileged orders, began to be entertained.'† 'This that Knox did for this nation,' says his illustrious countryman Carlyle,‡ 'we may really call a resurrection as from death. The people began to *live*; they needed, first of all, to do that at what cost, and costs soever. Scotch literature and thought, Scotch industry, James Watt, David Hume, Walter Scott, Robert Burns; I find Knox and the reformation, acting in the heart's core of every one of these persons, and phenomena; I find that without the reformation, they would not have been. Or what of Scotland? The puritanism of Scotland became that of England, of New England. A tumult in the high church of Edinburgh, spread into a universal battle and struggle over all these realms; there came out, after fifty years struggling, what we call the *glorious revolution*, a *habeas corpus* act, free parliaments, and much else! He is the one Scotchman, to whom, of all others, his country and the world owe a debt. He has to plead that Scotland would forgive him for having been worth to it any million 'unblamable' Scotchmen, that need no forgiveness! He bared his breast to the battle; had to row in French galleys; wander forlorn, in exile, in clouds and storms; was censured, shot at through his windows; had a right sore fighting

* Ibid, p. 304. At p. 463, he shows from Knox, Hist. pp. 363, 366, that in his sentiments Knox had the express approbation of the principal divines of the foreign churches. See also vol. ii. p. 260.

† Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 305. A party were still favorable to a republic, as late as 1638. See Dr. Aiton's Life and Times of Alex. Henderson, p. 228. See also p. 524.

‡ Lect. on Heroes, p. 235.

life; if this world were his place of recompense, he had made but a bad venture of it. I cannot apologize for Knox. To him it is very indifferent, these two hundred and fifty years or more, what men say of him. But we, having got above all those details of his battle, and living now in clearness on the fruits of his victory, we, for our own sake, ought to look through the rumors and controversies enveloping the man, into the man himself.

Buchanan's favorite and famous treatise, '*De Jure Regni apud Scotos*,' published in 1579, had much influence in diffusing free and liberal views as to the origin and limits of kingly power. Buchanan's views may be further ascertained from the fact of his having whipped king James when a boy for not obeying him, and from his declaration, made when on his death-bed, and when it was told him that the king was greatly incensed at his writing the work mentioned, and his History, 'I am not much concerned about that,' said he, 'for I am shortly going to a place where there are few kings.*' These views were extended by the celebrated Melville in his lectures. 'In an age,' says Dr. McCrie,† 'when the principles of liberty were but partially diffused, and under an administration fast tending to despotism, there was, at least, one man holding an important public situation, who

* Chalmers's Biog. Dict. vol. vii. pp. 231, 232. Dryden engages to prove, from Buchanan and Calvin, that they set the people above the magistrate. (Poet. Wks. vol. i. p. 347. Pref. to the Medal.) 'Buchanan's Treatise,' says Edward Irving, (Confessions of Faith, Lond. 1831, Pref. p. cxxx, and cxxxi.) and Knox's 'First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women,' 'contain essentially upon the subject of obedience to the powers that be, that which hath wrought like a leaven in the church and realm of Scotland, and may exhalt that country as the most formidable seat of radicalism and rebellion in the world.' Again speaking of their doctrine of opposition to kings, he says 'which is to make the definition and dignity of the royal office to be, not of divine ordination, but of human agreement; and to bring in the doctrine of the social compact, and the rights of the people, whose natural fruit is revolution, and destruction of all social relations whatever.'

†Life of Melville, vol. ii. pp. 115, 116.

dared to avow such principles, and who embraced an opportunity of imparting to his pupils those liberal views of civil government, by which the presbyterian ministers were long distinguished, and by which all the efforts of a servile band of prelates, in concert with an arbitrary court, and a selfish nobility, were afterwards unable to extinguish or suppress.'

Welwood, the friend of Melville, and professor of laws, was accused of inculcating similar sentiments. So that king James abolished the professorship, declaring 'that the profession of laws is noways necessary at this time;'^{*} a truth which no one will ever dispute, seeing that the king had determined that his will was law.[†] King James has given the true reason of the obnoxiousness of the presbyterian government to all kings in his 'True Law of Free Monarchies.' 'A free monarch,'[‡] he says, 'that is, one who is free from all restraints or control, can make statutes as he thinks meet, without asking the advice of parliaments or states, and can suspend parliamentary laws, for reasons known to himself only.' The writings of Calvin, Buchanan, and Ponet, he calls, therefore, 'apologies for rebellions and treasons.' In his *Basilikon Doron* he was more explicit. He here taught[‡] that it belongs to the king to judge when preachers wander from their text, and that such as refuse to submit to his judgment in such cases, deserve to be capitally punished; that no ecclesiastical assemblies ought to be held without his consent; that no man

^{*} Life of Melville, vol. ii. p. 120.

[†] These principles were afterwards developed by Rutherford, in his 'Lex Rex,' in 1644, and by Guthrie in his 'The Causes of God's Wrath,' which were called in and burned in Edinburgh by the common hangman. (Hist. of Westminster Assembly, p. 363.) Also in the Apologetical Relation; Naphtali; (1680;) Jus Populi, by Mr. James Stewart of Goodtrees; Hist. of the Indulgence; Banders Disbanded; Rectius Instruendum; and Shield's Hind Let Loose, and The Mystery of Magistracy Unveiled.

[‡] Life of Melville, vol. ii. p. 159. § Ibid, p. 162.

is more to be hated of a king than a proud puritan; that parity among ministers is irreconcilable with monarchy, inimical to order, and the mother of confusion; that puritans had been a pest to the commonwealth and church of Scotland, wished to engross the civil government as tribunes of the people, sought the introduction of democracy into the state, and quarrelled with the king because he was a king; that the chief persons among them should not be allowed to remain in the land; in fine, that parity in the church should be banished, episcopacy set up, and all who preached against bishops, rigorously punished. Such were the sentiments which James entertained, and which he had printed, at the very time that he was giving out that he had no intention of altering the government of the church, or of introducing episcopacy.*

Hence, the political principles of the papists were agreeable to James; and the chiefs of that party paid assiduous court to him, by flattering his love of power, and inveighing against the levelling doctrines, and republican spirit, of the reforming ministers. And hence the envenomed hatred manifested by James to the immortal Melville, the pride and ornament of his country, and the moral hero of his age. 'Sir,' said Melville to the king, on one occasion, when, having taken him by the sleeve in his fervor, and called him 'God's silly vassal,' he proceeded to address him in the following strain, perhaps the most singular in point of freedom, that ever saluted royal ears, or that ever proceeded from the mouth of a loyal subject who would have spilt his blood in defence of the person and honor of his prince.† 'We will always humbly reverence your majesty in public, but since we have

* McCrie's *Life of Melville*, ii. 37.

† Ibid, p. 66. See the whole speech. See also similar ones, in vol. i. pp. 171, 196, and vol. ii. pp. 244, 145. See also the declaration of the supreme power of the people, made by Alexander Henderson, in his second answer to the king. *Life and Times*, by Dr. Aiton, p. 644.

this occasion to be with your majesty in private, and since ye are brought in extreme danger, both of your life and crown, and along with you the country and church of God are like to go to wreck, for not telling you the truth, and giving you faithful counsel, we must discharge our duty, or else be traitors both to Christ and you. Therefore, sir, as diverse times before I have told you, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings, and two kingdoms in Scotland; there is Christ Jesus, the king of the church, whose subject king James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom he is not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. Those whom Christ has called, and commanded to watch over his church, and govern his spiritual kingdom, have sufficient power and authority from him to do this, both jointly and severally, the which, no christian king or prince should control and discharge, but fortify and assist; otherwise, they are not faithful subjects of Christ, and members of his church. We will yield to you your place, and give you all due obedience; but again I say, you are not the head of the church; you cannot give us that eternal life, which even in this world we seek for, and you cannot deprive us of it.'

We need not add, that among the charges alleged against Melville, one was, that he wished to 'overturn episcopacy, and to establish upon its ruins the ecclesiastical republicanism of Geneva.'*

Does any one ask why the church of Scotland became so impregnated with republican principles, the answer is found in the very nature of her reform. In her case, as in Germany, the order was essentially the reverse of what took place in England. 'The reform in England,'† says a

* Life of Melville, p. 67.

†Milne on the Difference between the Presb. Estab. and the Episc. Ch. of Scotland, Aberdeen, 1841. In Dr. McCrie's Writings, pp. 171, 175.

high-toned prelatist, 'was a monarchic movement.'* In Scotland, on the other hand, the whole movement was effected by the people, against the influence and wishes of the monarch.† Knox and his coadjutors, men of the people, obscure in station and limited in resources, threw down the gauntlet at the foot of the throne. They made their appeal to the people. They addressed themselves to the understanding of the people, and in their own language, and threw themselves upon their bravery. Nor were they disappointed. Their burning thoughts, and heartfelt truths, once received into the bosom of society, sent forth a tide of life through every vein and artery. The reformation in Scotland was essentially republican, that is, it originated and was carried through by the people, in opposition to the nobility and the monarch. The polity of the church received, therefore, the impress of the mould in which it was cast, and has ever been characterized by a popular, representative, and republican spirit. It has, in fact, always been the reproach of the presbyterian church, that she is too popular.‡

At the reformation, the ecclesiastical supremacy was found lodged in the hands of the pope, that is, the government of the church was an absolute monarchy. There were, therefore, but three courses open to the reformers. They could transfer this supremacy to the state; to a council of bishops; or to the church, represented by its ministers and elders in ecclesiastical courts. Now England chose the first of these alternatives, and Scotland the last. The king, or the state, had nothing to do with the church of Scotland in its formation. They may be said rather to have been its persecutors, down

*Dr. Taylor's Hist. Biog. of the age of Elizabeth, vol. ii. pp. 57, 58.

†See the Edinb. Rev. for 1836, Oct. p. 51. Presb. Rev. July, 1842, p. 236. See also Dr. Hodge's Constitutional Hist. of the Presb. Ch. part i. p. 58-60, where the point is well illustrated from their standards.

‡See Lectures on the Headship of Christ, pp. 45, 46, 52, 53.

to the period of its public recognition.* All was done by the people, and by spiritual authority alone. Taking the Bible as their guide, and its charter as their warrant, they constituted themselves into a regular church, administered ordinances, and drew up that plan of discipline, which they believed to be most accordant to the word of God, most consonant to the practice of the truly primitive church, best adapted to guard against spiritual despotism, and most likely to advance the cause of Christ. Every feature of the polity of the Scotch church, in its general outlines, was, therefore, republican. Her schools were 'little republics,'† and even the superintendents, out of which prelatical ingenuity has endeavored to torture some resemblance to prelates, were appointed on 'democratical principles.'‡ A portion of the Scottish people have always been ready, even under their monarchy, to avow their republican predilections. 'The remains of the school of Melville, led on by Mr. William Scott, and Mr. John Carmichael, were favorable to a republic, and opposed to every phantom of episcopacy, in all its modifications.§ In asserting the internal and independent authority of the church, it was contended,|| that the king 'has no power to prohibit one called by the church, which in every point possesses, as a perfect republic, this spiritual intrinsic power.' The royalists regarded¶ 'the sacred person of the king as the only impediment to the republican liberty and confusion, which the covenanters have designed

* Mr. Mackenzie, in his *History of the Christian Church*, Lond. 1842, at p. 313, states, that 'the spirit in which the Scottish reformation was conducted, appears to have been less christian, as well as less catholic, than that which took place in England.' In illustration of this, he states, 'the right divine of kings, which, until after this period, was scarcely questioned in England, was not only canvassed by the Scottish presbyterians, but was declared by them to be a fallacy.' *Fas est ah hoste doceri*. See also Maurice's *Kingdom of Christ*, Pref.

† Chalmers, *Wks.* vol. xii. p. 217.

‡ Dr. McCrie's *Miscell. Writings*, p. 178.

§ *Life and Times of Henderson*, by Dr. Aiton, p. 241.

|| *Ibid.*, 331. ¶ *Pp.* 402, and 448, 482, 483.

themselves' The strength of this party, is further described by Dr. Aiton, when speaking of the puritans, he says,* 'this sect were of themselves, at first, few in number, and would not have made a figure in England so soon, had they not been nursed into strength by a party in Scotland, whose authority had become supreme. Henderson and his friends were attached to the monarchy, and wished merely to secure their own church against persecution. These were devoted to their faith, with self-abasement, penitence, and gratitude; but they were opposed by another party of energetic and inflexible presbyterians, who coalesced with the political puritans of the sister kingdom.' 'Is it any wonder then,' asks Dr. Hodge,† 'that the Scotch abhorred episcopacy? It was in their experience identified with despotism, superstition, and irreligion. Their love of presbyterianism was one with their love of liberty and religion. As the parliament of Scotland was never a fair representation of the people, the general assembly of their church became their great organ for resisting oppression, and withstanding the encroachments of their sovereigns. The conflict, therefore, which, in England, was so long kept up between the crown and the house of commons, was, in Scotland, sustained between the crown and the church. This was one reason why the Scotch became so attached to presbyterianism; this too was the reason why the Stuarts hated it, and determined, at all hazards, to introduce prelacy as an ally to despotism.'

* Life and Times of Henderson, by Dr. Aiton, p. 524.

† Hist. of the Presb. Ch. part. i. p. 58. For further illustrations of the noble conduct of our Scottish fathers in battling for liberty, see The History of the Covenanters, vol. i. pp. 199, 230, and vol. ii. pp. 52, 65, 125, 184. Also Patrick Welwood, p. 76-78. Presb. Rev. Ap. 1839, pp. 631, 681, 694. Irving's Last Days, pp. 551, 553. Dr. Aiton's Life and Times of Henderson, pp. 297, 449.

SECTION III.

The republicanism of presbytery illustrated from its history in modern times in England.

We now pass to the history of presbyterianism in England. The genealogy of presbytery in England is not fully understood. It is thus given by Fuller: 'In the days of king Edward it was conceived; in the reign of queen Mary (but beyond sea at Frankfort) was born; in the reign of queen Elizabeth it was nursed and weaned; under king James I, grew up a youth; but toward the end of king Charles's reign, shot up to the full strength and stature of a man, able not only to cope with, but to conquer the hierarchy, its enemy.' But he might have gone even further back, to the time of Henry VIII, or even earlier. There were in fact two reformations struggling together for establishment in England; the one monarchic, the other democratic; the former relying for its support on power, the latter seeking strength by courting popularity.*

In the reign of Elizabeth, the commons were in favor of puritanism, because of its democratic principles, which were, like it, opposed to the power of royalty and aristocracy.† The Irish church, from its commencement, evinced a still greater leaning to puritanism than the church of England.‡ In short, the church of England, in the age of Elizabeth, had no hold on the affections of the great body of the nation. It was only maintained by the strong arm of power, and by the zealous exertions of those whom grants of abbey-lands had won to its support. 'Among the middle ranks, puritanism was all but universal.'§

* Taylor's Biography of the Eliz. Age, vol. ii. p. 67.

† Ibid, p. 78.

‡ Ibid, p. 81.

§ Ibid, p. 97.

In fact, the prelatie constitution of the English church never was, and never will be, popular. The people, and many of the clergy, have ever been, from the first, protesting parties. It never received the national acquiescence, but awakened indignation, roused the spirit of rebellion, and summoned men to the defence of their liberties, until the scene closed in anarchy and blood.* 'In England,' says Mr. Lathbury, 'the reformation was effected by the authority of government.'† 'It made, therefore, the executive the religious teacher; it instituted uniformity of belief in a human creed as the criterion of salvation; it arrogated to the regenerated church the sole possession of apostolical descent; it cut off all possible intercommunion with other religious bodies; and, withal, made the people the crouching slaves of a high priesthood. These things we charge upon the English reformation as its serious deficiencies. We charge upon it, that the people were never consulted, in the mutilation of their parish temples, in their change of rites, or the nature of their instruction. We charge upon it, that it left irregularly, unjustly distributed wealth among the clergy. We charge upon it, that it assumed itself to be so exclusively apostolical, that it would recognise the officers of no other church, — except we admit that it did, and still does, recognise the papal hierarchy.'‡

The popular will in England found voice in puritanism. By their intercourse with foreign protestants, and their sympathy with the foreign churches, the people of Eng-

* See Edinb. Review, Oct. 1836, p. 51.

† Hist. of the English Episcop. in *ibid.* p. 52. 'A king,' says Ma-cauley, (*Miscellanies*, vol. i. p. 243, Boston ed.) 'whose character may be best described by saying, that he was despotism itself personified, unprincipled ministers, a rapacious aristocracy, a servile Parliament; such were the instruments by which England was delivered from the yoke of Rome. The work, which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest, Sprung from brutal passion, nurtured by selfish policy,' &c.

‡ Edinb. Rev. *ibid.* p. 52.

land had ever before their eyes the vision of a spiritual republic, and this they believed to be realized in the church of Geneva.* And finding under a civil monarchy nothing but oppression and spiritual thralldom, they were anxiously led to inquire into their civil rights. They soon discovered, that the whole jugglery about the divine institution and right of kings, as well as their absolute power, had no foundation in fact or reason, but arose from an old alliance between ecclesiastical and civil policy. They found, that to preserve their own rank, dignity, wealth, and power, prelates claimed a divine right for themselves and for kings, and had imposed their usurpations upon a silly world.†

The character of the despots with whom they had to contend, thoroughly schooled the puritans in the truth and importance of their views. Henry VIII was despotism itself personified. Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest, enforced conformity by penal laws, only because this was the fastness which arbitrary power was making strong for itself.‡ Of Charles I, it has been said, that his whole life was a lie; that he hated the constitution the more because he had been compelled to feign respect for it, and that to him the love and the honor of his people were as nothing.§ Churchmen, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Independents, his enemies, his friends, his tools, English, Scotch, Irish, all divisions and subdivisions of his people had been deceived by him.

Such were the despots, male and female, against whom the puritans were called upon to contend. A systematic political opposition, vehement, daring, and inflexible, was thus engendered. From religion, they were led to politics. Debarred their religious rights, crushed in their assertion

* Dr. Taylor's Hist. Biogr. of the Age of Elizabeth.

† Bolingbroke's Idea of a Patriot King, p. 79.

‡ Macauley's Miscell. vol. i. p. 249.

§ Ibid, pp. 267 and 290.

of freedom of conscience, and persecuted for exercising the inalienable privilege of private judgment, the puritans were forced to turn against the power that thus oppressed them, and to assert their original and sovereign independence. All lawful government having been dissolved, and an arbitrary despotism established, their monarchs were justly regarded as usurpers and tyrants, and all allegiance to them as for ever forfeited. The spirit of liberty was grafted upon the stock of religion, and was thus quickened with a heavenly ardor, and an impetuous zeal, against which nothing could stand. During the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth, the youthful Hercules was found strong enough to crush the serpent, in the question of monopolies. While Whitgift contended for the absolute despotism of monarchy, 'Cartwright gave utterance to the system of a democratic republic,'* while 'the house of commons, itself, exhibited strong symptoms of hostility to prelacy, which could hardly be kept in check, by the strong interference of the crown.'† In the reign of James the number of the puritans became greater, and their exertions in the cause of freedom more apparent. With their growing intelligence and wealth, this spirit increased, until, in the reign of Charles I, a universal enthusiasm seized the nation, pervading not only the middle classes, but also many of the gentry, which declared, not only in words but actions, that while the king was resolved to be absolute, the people were determined to be free.‡ The republican party dates its origin from the early campaigns of the civil war. Coke laid its foundation in the Petition of Right, endued with

* Dr. Taylor's Hist. Biog. of the Eliz. age, vol. ii. p. 84. In his table of dangerous doctrines, avouched by Cartwright, Whitgift says, (Def. of the Answ. Prefatory matter, 19th error,) 'he affirmeth that the government of the church is aristocratical, or popular, and therefore his opinion must needs be, that no government of any commonwealth ought to be monarchical, but either aristocratical or popular; which is a dangerous error.'

† Ibid, p. 85.

‡ See Alison's Hist. and Macauley's Miscel. vol. i. p. 251.

the form of law, in 1628. Selden built on this foundation. Hampden, Pym, Vane, St. John, Cromwell, and Sydney, completed the superstructure, which Sydney has immortalized by his writings and his blood.* That the government aimed at by the commonwealth men was republican, Mr. Godwin assumes as undeniable. Nor did the republican party expire with the restoration, but continued in a distinct form, until the revolution in 1688.† Their character, too, though constantly attacked, and scarcely ever defended, is still popular with the great body of Englishmen, to the present day, while the principles, for which they fought, are daily advancing in their rapid progress towards ultimate and complete triumph. ‘But for the weakness of that foolish Ishbosheth, (Cromwell’s son,) the opinions we have been expressing,’ says Macauley,‡ ‘would, we believe, now have formed the orthodox creed of good Englishmen. We might now be writing under the government of his Highness, Oliver the Fifth, or Richard the Fourth, Protector, by the grace of God, of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the dominions thereto belonging. The form of the great founder of the dynasty, on horseback, as when he led the charge at Naseby, or on foot, as when he took the mace from the table of the commons, would adorn all our squares, and overlook our public offices, from Charing-Cross; and sermons in his praise would be duly preached on his lucky day, the third of September, by court-chaplains, guiltless of the abominations of the surplice.’

The puritans of England, those pioneers who led the presbyterian army, cleaving their way through the mountain barriers, which opposed all progress, have accom-

* Godwin’s Hist. of the Commonwealth, vol. i. pp. 1 – 5, 6, 9, and ch. i.

† Godwin, *ibid.*, pp. 1 – 5, and p. 6, and Guizot’s Hist. of Civilization, vol. i. pp. 307 and 310.

‡ Miscell. vol. i. pp. 301, 302.

plished a noble work.* At the commencement of the eighteenth century, every free constitution in Europe had gone down, overwhelmed by the deluge of spiritual despotism. That of England, alone, weathered the storm — and why? Why was it, that, in that epidemic malady of constitutions, this escaped the destroying influence; or rather that, at the very crisis of the disease, a favorable turn took place in England, and in England alone? The peculiar glory of the puritans is, ‘that, in this great plague and mortality of constitutions, they took their stand between the living and the dead. At the very crisis of its destiny, at the very moment when the fate which had passed on every other nation was about to pass on England, they arrested the danger; so that whatever of political freedom exists, either in Europe or in America, has sprung, directly or indirectly, from those institutions which they secured and reformed.’†

From puritanism, hung as it is in gibbets, like the bones of its leading advocates, we have our habeas corpus, our free representation of the people; acknowledgment, wide as the world, that all men are, or else must, shall, and will become, what we call free men.‡ ‘Protestantism,’ adds Mr. Carlyle,§ ‘was a revolt against spiritual sovereignties, popes, and much else. Presbyterianism, carried out the revolt against earthly sovereignties and despotisms. Protestantism has been called the grand root, from which our

* See Dr. Price’s *Hist. of Non-conformity*, vol. ii. pp. 3, 26.

† Macauley’s *Miscell.* vol. i. pp. 271, 277, 253. See also similar attestations, by Lord Brougham, in his speeches, vol. ii. pp. 43, 53. To the Puritans of the Long Parliament, we owe the abolition of the infamous practice of torture, till then legalized in England. *Edinb. Rev.* April, 1838, p. 64. A Puritan was a friend of liberty. Neal’s *Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. i. pp. 9, 10. See *ibid.* vol. i. pp. 115, 116, 126, 280, 297, 320, 333, 337, 421, 424, 427, 463, 473, 475, 477, &c. See Guizot’s high testimony in *Hist. of Civilization*, p. 307. The Stuart Dynasty, by Dr. Vaughan, vol. i. p. iii. et passim. See p. 355. Preliminary Disc. to the prose works of Milton, by A. St. John, vol. i.

‡ Carlyle on *Heroes*, p. 334.

§ *Ibid.* p. 200.

whole subsequent European history, branches out; for the spiritual will always body itself forth in the temporal history of men. The spiritual is the beginning of the temporal. And now, sure enough, the cry is every where for liberty and equality, independence, and so forth; instead of kings, ballot-boxes, and electoral suffrages.'

'The honest truth is,' says the celebrated archdeacon Blackburne, 'that these very controversies (respecting the Genevan discipline) first struck out, and in due time perfected, those noble and generous principles of civil and religious liberty, which too probably, without those struggles, or something of the same sort, would hardly have been well understood to this very hour. It is to the controversy about the Geneva Discipline, that we owe the efforts of the excellent Castallio, to disgrace the infernal doctrine of punishing heretics capitally!!'*

'The tree of liberty,' says the Rev. Thomas Scott, author of the commentary,† 'sober and legitimate liberty, *civil and religious*, under the shadow of which we in the establishment, as well as others, repose in peace, and the fruit of which we gather, was planted by the puritans, and watered, if not by their blood, at least by their tears and sorrows. *Yet it is the modern fashion, to feed delightfully on the fruit, and then revile, if not curse, those who planted and watered it.*'

In thus identifying puritanism and republicanism, we have not been speaking without book. Elizabeth hated presbytery, and why? — because 'it held principles inconsistent with allegiance to her crown.'‡ 'She believed that the maintenance of episcopacy was necessary to the continuance of royalty.'§ 'She knew that the church of Geneva, which the puritans declared to be their model,

* On the Intermediate State. Lond. 1772, p. xxxiii.

† Letters on Conformity. Wks. vol. ix. p. 532.

‡ Taylor's Biog. of the Eliz. Age, vol. ii. p. 77.

§ And not unreasonably, says the above author, p. 68.

was not only essentially republican, but could not be perfectly established, except in a republic.' Being, therefore, a pope in spirit, she decreed, that it would be 'prejudicial to her crown.' This had been demonstrated to her, by Lord Burleigh, who said, that those views of church government which should popularize it, would end in an 'abatement of her prerogative,' as, in this way, a power would be set up, distinct from hers, over which she could exercise no control.

King James hated presbytery, and why? At the Hampton Court Conference, called by him, in 1604, in mockery of the puritans, and to cover his own hypocrisy and apostasy, Dr. (afterwards bishop) Reynolds, happening to name the word presbytery, the king broke out in the following kingly and most graphic speech. 'You are aiming at a Scot's presbytery, which agrees with monarchy as well as God and the devil. Then Jack and Tom, and Will and Dick, shall meet, and at their pleasures censure me and my council, and all our proceedings. Then Will shall stand up and say, it must be thus; then Dick shall reply and say, nay, marry, but we will have it thus; and therefore, here I must once more reiterate my former speech, and say, *Le roi s'avisera*; the king alone shall decide.' Turning to the bishops, he avowed his belief, that the hierarchy was the firmest support of the throne. Of the puritans, he added — 'I will make them conform, or I will harry them out of the land, or else worse,' 'only hang them; that's all.*' So also in his speech to parlia-

* One great source of objection to the Genevan translation of the Bible, was, that in the notes appended to it, were many things adverse to the principles of government, civil and ecclesiastical, established in England. On this ground, King James, in the conference at Hampton Court, pronounced them seditious, and savoring too much of dangerous and traitorous concerts. — Cardwell's Document. Annals. vol. ii. p. 12. c. v. 1588.

In connection with this conference, let any man contrast the conduct and language of the bishops, with those of the presbyterians, and he will learn much as to their respective bearings. See McCrie's *Life of Melville*, vol. ii. pp. 192, 195, 202, 203, 233, 253, 265, 267.

ment, the king said,* ‘ they do not so far differ from us in points of religion, as in their confused form of policy and parity ; being ever discontented with the present government, and impatient to suffer any superiority, which maketh their sects insufferable in any well-governed commonwealth.’†

Charles I. hated presbytery, and why ? When urged to consent to the removal of episcopacy, he alleged, as one reason of his refusal, that it was more friendly to monarchy than presbytery.‡ Writing on this subject to his devoted episcopal friends and counsellors, Lord Jermyn, Lord Culpepper, and Mr. Ashburnham, he expresses himself thus : ‘ Show me any precedent wherever presbyterial government and regal was together, without perpetual rebellions ; which was the cause that necessitated the king, my father, to change that government in Scotland. And even in France, where they are but upon tolerance, (which in likelihood should cause moderation,) did they ever sit still so long as they had power to rebel ? And it cannot be otherwise, for the ground of their doctrine is anti-monarchical. Indeed, to prove that clearly, would require more time, and a better pen, than I have. I will say, without hyperbole, that there was not a wiser man since Solomon, than he who said — no bishop, no king.’ In his letters, the king further states,§ ‘ that he looks on episcopacy as a stronger support of monarchical power, than even the army. From causes which we have already considered, the established church had been, since the

* Ibid, p. 474.

† The Millenary petition of the puritans, on James’s coming into England, was formally declared to be opposed to monarchy.—Mc Crie’s *Life of Melville*, vol. ii. p. 189.

‡ See Clarendon State Papers, vol. ii. pp. 202, 260, 274, in Dr. Miller on Min. p. xxiv. See further evidence in Dr. Aiton’s *Life and Times of Alexander Henderson*, pp. 57, 228, 294, 445.

§ Macauley’s *Miscell.* vol. i. p. 293.

reformation, the great bulwark of the prerogative. Charles wished, therefore, to preserve it.*

This tendency of puritanism toward 'a popular state,' was made the ground of its severest persecutions † This charge against all the reformed churches, and the church of Scotland, in particular, constituted one chief topic of discussion, in the celebrated discourse of archbishop Bancroft — the fountain of high-churchism.‡ 'This notion of the tendency of the puritanic doctrine, to a parity in the church and commonwealth, was that wherewith Laud, who martyred his king and country, envenomed the heart of that deluded monarch — and gratified his own malevolence, in the barbarities inflicted on his opponents.§ The professed design of Heylen's History of that 'active sect,' the presbyterians, was to show, as he says in his title-page, 'their opposition to monarchical and episcopal government, &c.'||

The republicanism of presbytery was even preached against by no less a personage than dean Swift.¶ 'Upon the cruel persecutions,' he says, 'raised against the protestants under Queen Mary, among the great number who fled the kingdom, to seek for shelter, *several went and resided at*

* I have a copy of the rare work, published by authority of Charles II, 'The History of the English and Scotch Presbytery, wherein is discovered their designs and practices, for the subversion of government in church and state!' 2d ed. 1660, with a curious frontispiece, representing the English church in a tree, which is being cut down, and a crown below, with the motto, 'tollat te qui te non novit.'

† See a letter from Parker and Sandys, in Strype's Parker, ii. 281, in Price's Hist. of Nonconf. vol. i. p. 281, and Parker's Let. to the Com. in Strype, ii. 323, in do. vol. i. p. 279.

‡ McCrie's Life of Melville, vol. i. p. 387. Among the propositions which he extracted from the writings of the puritans, even at that early day, were these. (Dr. Vaughan's Stuart Dynasty, vol. i. p. 40.) 'The authority which princes have, is given them from the people; and upon occasions, the people may take it away again, as men may revoke their proxies and letters of authority.'

§ See Dedic. to his speech in the Star chamb. in the Let. and Episc. pp. 341, 346.

|| Oxf. 1670, and lib. v.

¶ Sermons on the Martyrdom of Charles I.

Geneva, which is a commonwealth, governed without a king, where the religion, contrived by Calvin, is without the order of bishops. When the protestant faith was restored by Queen Elizabeth, those who fled to Geneva, returned, among the rest, home to England, and *were grown so fond of the government and religion of the place they had left, that they used all possible endeavors, to introduce both into their own country.* From hence they proceeded, by degrees, to quarrel with the KINGLY GOVERNMENT, because, *as I have already said, the city of Geneva, to which their fathers had flown for refuge, was a commonwealth, or government of the people.'*

But this was not enough. The poet laureat must popularize the same charge against presbytery. Dryden, therefore, under the character of a wolf, thus characterizes presbytery.*

' Last of all, the *litter* 'scaped by chance,
And from Geneva first infested France.
Some authors thus his pedigree will trace,
But others write him of an upstart race ;
Because of Wickliffe's brood no mark he brings,
But his innate ANTIPATHY TO KINGS.
What tho' your native kennel still be small,
Bounded between a puddle and a wall ?
Yet your victorious colonies are sent,
Where the North-ocean girds the continent.
Quickened with fire below your monster's breed,
In *fenny* Holland, and in fruitful Tweed ;
And like the *first*, the last effects to be
Drawn to the dregs of a Democracy.
But as the poisons of the deadliest kind,
Are to their own unhappy coast confined,
So PRESBYTERY and its pestilential zeal,
CAN FLOURISH ONLY IN A COMMONWEAL.'

* Hind and Panther, as above. Was not Bishop Burnet also subject to the charge, of entertaining and inculcating anti-monarchical and republican principles, because he sought to conciliate the Dissenters, and, in unison with them, opposed the doctrines of passive obedience, and unqualified non-resistance to the ruling power, that is, arbitrary government ? — Hist. Ref. vol i. Nares's pref. p. xvii.

The same charge of republicanism was urged against presbyterians by Jeremy Taylor,* and by Isaac Taylor, who calls republicanism the presbyterian principle,† and is dwelt upon at length, as one founded in necessary causes, and springing from principle and not merely from analogy, by Mr. Woodgate.‡

SECTION V.

The republicanism of presbytery demonstrated from its history in these United States.

Having thus traced the connection between presbyterianism and republicanism, both in ecclesiastical and in civil government, from its revival and establishment at the era of the reformation, through all its eventful struggles in England and in Scotland, we are naturally led to inquire, what relation it bears to this great American republic, — and who can deny, that it stands to it, in the all-important relation of a cause to its effect? The pilgrim fathers, the inhabitants of New England, were, we have seen, all presbyterian in essential principles, and many

* See quoted in Dr. Reed's Hist. of the Presb. Ch. in Ireland, vol. ii. p. 346.

† Spiritual Despotism, sect. iv. p. 177, et preced. Eng. ed.

‡ Bampton Lectures, pp. 20, 349, 351, 352, &c. See also in further illustration of the republicanism of presbytery, Neal's Puritans, vol. i. p. 469; vol. ii. pp. 6, 7, 14, 16, 20, 93. Milner's Life of Watts, pp. 79, 82, 83, 85. Baxter's Views on, in Edinb. Rev. Oct. 1839, p. 111. Soame's Elizabethan Rel. Hist. pp. 35, 70, 165, 179, 180, 184, 414, 518, 545, 548, 587, 592, 593. Rogers's Life of Howe, pp. 364, 365. Divine Right of the Ministry, part ii. p. 107. Rutherford's Plea for Paul's Presbytery, p. iii. and pp. 83, 199, 247. Gillespie's Aaron's Rod Blossoming, pp. 176–182. Sketch of the History and Princ. of the Presb. Ch. in England, pp. 30, 35, 43. The fullest authorities, in the words of the original and scarce writings of the puritans in every age, will be found in Hanbury's Memorials of the Independents or Congregationalists, of which two volumes have already appeared.

of them by distinct avowal.* It has also been proved, that the substantial portion of South Carolina, and other colonies, were either originally, or eventually, presbyterian emigrants, who sought, in this new world, a refuge from oppression, and the enjoyment of freedom.† Now, what we affirm, is, that the principles which gave birth to this American republic, were *brought* here, and were nurtured into full maturity, by these presbyterians. True it is, that they came here encased by the intolerant prejudices with which popery, their hard foster-mother, had imbued the minds of men. True it is, that in their first movements, we behold a most grotesque combination of liberty and tyranny, freedom and intolerance. But many of them were far in advance of their age, and all ultimately learned to think, and to act, in accordance with the genius of our republican christianity. The spirit of liberty was among them; and in the free air of this new world, untainted as yet by the breath of spiritual and civil despotism, it soon attained to a vigorous manhood, and, bursting those chains by which, for long ages, she had been fettered, stood forth redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled. Before the revolution there were thousands of christians, who had arrived at the fixed conclusion, that the civil magistrate has nothing to do with religion in his official capacity, but to protect the citizen in that form of worship which he prefers, and to secure to all men liberty of conscience. We have seen, that, in the very first adoption of their standards of faith, our presbyterian fathers erased all that militated against this opinion. We have seen, too, that it was through the powerful efforts of presbyterians, the separation between the church and the state was first secured, and permanently established. All the principles which are now

* See Dr. Hodge's Hist. of Presb. Ch. and Dr. Lang's Relig. Educ. in America, pp. 35, 309, 310. Also, Congreg. Order, Hist. Acct.

† See Dr. Hodge's Hist. of Presb. Ch. part i.

embodied in the fundamental laws of this country, were taught by these same despised and persecuted followers of Calvin, long before the fathers of those who framed our civil constitutions were born. The revolution only gave an opportunity for developing their strength and purity. They were then brought forth, from the hearts of men and the pages of theology, to the field of action. Their beauty, their power, their divinity, commended them to universal acceptance, until finally they became completely triumphant.

Let that great philosophical inquirer into our institutions, M. Tocqueville, attest the truth of what we say. 'If,' says he,* 'we carefully examine the social and political state of America, after having studied its history, we shall remain perfectly convinced that not an opinion, not a custom, not a law, I may even say not an event, is upon record which the origin of that people will not explain.' 'At the period of the first emigrations, the parish system, that fruitful germ of free institutions, was deeply rooted in the habits of the English; and with it the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people had been introduced even into the bosom of the monarchy of the house of Tudor.' 'The emigrants, or, as they deservedly styled themselves the pilgrims, belonged to that English sect, the austerity of whose principles had acquired for them the name of puritans. Puritanism was not merely a religious doctrine, but it corresponded in many points with the most absolute democratic and republican theories. It was this tendency which had roused its most dangerous adversaries. Persecuted by the government of the mother-country, and disgusted by the habits of a society opposed to the rigor of their own principles, the puritans went forth to seek some rude and unfrequented part of the world, where they could live according to their own

* *Democr. in Am.* vol. i. pp. 27, 28, 31, 32, 35.

opinions, and worship God in freedom!' 'A democracy, more perfect than any which antiquity had dreamed of, started in full size and panoply from the midst of an ancient feudal society.'

Let any man, we again say, attentively compare the solemn leagues and covenants, by which the continental and Scottish reformers, and the puritans and non-conformists at a later period, pledged themselves to one another by their lives, property, and sacred honor, and bound themselves to spend and be spent in the cause of civil and religious freedom, with our declaration of independence, and he will, we think, allow, that, in the former, we have the plan, the spirit, and the prototype of the latter.*

The politicians, therefore, who drew up the fundamental laws of these new states, only expressed the wishes of

* The honorable individual to whom this work is inscribed, first suggested this idea to the author. He has just found it expressed in the able discourse of the Rev. John McLeod, on Protestantism. (New York, 1843, pp. 21, 22.) 'And we have ourselves heard another distinguished civilian [Hon. Gulian C. Verplanck] of our own State, in a public address, trace the origin of the declaration of American independence to the National Covenant of Scotland. Nor was it a mere flight of fancy. The Scottish reformers from popery had drunk deep at the fountains of protestantism, as they had been opened on the continent of Europe, and especially in republican Geneva; or, rather, they had drunk, along with the continental reformers, at the same open fountain of God's word. They succeeded the reformers of the continent in the movement against antichrist, and had all the advantage of their lights. Their covenants were bonds of union among themselves, and public declarations of the grounds of their opposition to the antichristian system, in all its parts. And they were distinguished, *first*, as connecting civil and religious liberty together in the definitions of rights which they made — and, *secondly*, in combining all classes of the community in the effort to secure them. As first formed, and afterwards renewed at various crises of their history, the National Covenant of Scotland was a declaration of the independence of the Church of Christ, as a distinct community from the State; and of both Church and State from all foreign control. It was subscribed by the mass of the people, as well as the privileged orders. And as ultimately embodied with additions, in the solemn league and covenant, it became the constitution of the British empire. Under it, the presbyterians of Scotland and the north of Ireland, the puritans of England, of whom the majority were presbyterians, and all other protestants who chose to receive it, united together in the strife for liberty, which had already commenced.'

the entire presbyterian community, when they inserted provisions for securing complete religious liberty.* Indeed, the very style of some of the most famous of these celebrated enactments was in exact accordance with that which christians had previously employed in writing on the same subject. And it agrees better with the truth to say, that *forms of political government* were framed in conformity to principles received by these presbyterians, who were the most numerous class of christians among us, than that the converse of this took place. Our noble presbyterian forefathers, in many petitions and memorials, written with singular ability, demanded the establishment of ABSOLUTE LIBERTY, JUST AND TRUE LIBERTY, FULL AND IMPARTIAL LIBERTY, *in the proper sense of these terms.*†

If ever the great principles which led to our revolution are fairly canvassed, and the causes, which, amid so many discouragements, led us on to triumph, are fairly stated, it will be found that our faith and its teachers had much to do in obtaining our liberty. The blood of our people has stained, and their bones have bleached, on every battle-field of our country. If papacy or prelacy had prevailed in our land, our new free States would be provinces of Great Britain to the present hour. Withdraw from this land all the civil benefits which it has derived from the pilgrim and presbyterian fathers, and the remainder would be scarcely worth the possessing.‡

‘The part taken by presbyterians in the contest with the mother country,§ was, indeed, at the time, often made a ground of reproach; and the connection between their efforts for the security of their religious liberty, and opposition to the oppressive measures of parliament, was

* Tocquev. Dem. in Am. ii. pp. 317, 318.

† Dr. Rice’s Considerations on Religion. Richmond, 1832, p. 57.

‡ Rev. Nicholas Murray, New Jersey.

§ Hodge’s Hist. part ii. p. 484.

then distinctly seen.* Mr. Galloway, a prominent advocate of the government, ascribed, in 1774, the revolt and revolution mainly to the action of the presbyterian clergy and laity as early as 1764, when the proposition for a general synod emanated from a committee appointed for that purpose in Philadelphia.† This was a great exaggeration and mistake, but it indicates the close connection between the civil and religious part of the controversy. The same writer describes the opponents of the government, as an ‘united faction of congregationalists, presbyterians, and smugglers.’ Another writer of the same period says, ‘you will have discovered, that I am no friend to presbyterians, and that I fix all the blame of these extraordinary American proceedings upon them.’‡ He goes on, ‘believe, sir, the presbyterians have been the chief and principal instruments in all these flaming measures; and they always do and ever will act against government, from that restless and turbulent anti-monarchical spirit which has always distinguished them every where, when they had, or by any means could assume power, however illegally.’

‘As the conduct of the presbyterian clergy during the revolutionary war is not a matter of dispute, all that we are called upon to do,’ adds Dr. Hodge, ‘is briefly to exhibit the action of the synod in reference to this subject.’

The synod of New York were the very first to declare

* ‘So also in England, on the question of the American war,’ says Dr. Vaughan, (*Congregationalism*, p. 122,) ‘dissenters were more inclined to the side of the colonists, than to that of the mother country, which exposed them to much resentment and suffering. Then came the revolution in France, and, in the early days of that movement, dissenters expressed themselves strongly in favor of the changes contemplated in that kingdom, and their conduct, in this instance, called forth further indignation from the same quarter.’

† Reed’s Address, p. 51

‡ By presbyterians, this writer means non-episcopalians.

themselves in favor of the struggle, a year before the declaration of independence, and to encourage and guide their people, then in arms.* During the war, they sustained and invigorated the forces of their beleaguered country; so that presbyterians were every where treated with special cruelty and revenge.† At the close of the war, they again addressed their people, and offered up praise to God, who had given them the victory.‡ They were the first to recognise the declaration of independence, *when made*; and they materially aided in the passage of that noble act.§

‘ When the declaration of independence was under debate in the continental congress, doubts and forebodings were whispered through that hall. The houses hesitated, wavered, and, for a while, the liberty and slavery of the nation appeared to hang in an even scale. It was then an aged patriarch arose, a venerable and stately form; his head white with the frost of years. Every eye went to him with the quickness of thought, and remained with the fixedness of the polar star. He cast on the assembly a look of inexpressible interest and unconquerable determination; while on his visage, the hue of age was lost in the flush of a burning patriotism, that fired his cheek. ‘ There is,’ said he, when he saw the house wavering, ‘ There is a tide in the affairs of men — a nick of time. We perceive it now before us. To hesitate, is to consent to our own slavery. That noble instrument upon your table, which insures immortality to its author, should be subscribed this very morning, by every pen in the house. He that will not respond to its accents, and strain every nerve to carry into effect its provisions, is unworthy the

* Dr. Lang’s Relig. and Educ. in Amer. p. 72, where their letter is given.

† Ibid, p. 77, 78. See also Dr. Miller’s Life of Dr. Rogers, p. 234, 8vo. ed.

‡ Ibid, p. 78.

§ Ibid, p. 94.

name of a freeman. For my own part, of property I have some — of reputation, more. That reputation is staked, that property is *pledged*, on the issue of this contest. And although these gray hairs must soon descend into the sepulchre, I would infinitely rather they should descend thither by the hands of the public executioner, than desert, at this crisis, the sacred cause of my country.' Who was it that uttered this memorable speech,—potent in turning the scales of the nation's destiny, and worthy to be preserved in the same imperishable record in which is registered the not more eloquent speech ascribed to John Adams, on the same sublime occasion? 'It was John Witherspoon — at that day the most distinguished presbyterian minister west of the Atlantic ocean — the father of the presbyterian church in the United States.'*

An inquiry into the matter would show, by an actual biography of the veterans of the revolution, that a large proportion of them were connected with the presbyterian church. Without attempting to make such an investigation, we will merely mention the following facts which have incidentally fallen into our hands in reference to South Carolina.

The battles of the 'Cowpens,' of 'King's Mountain' — and also the severe skirmish known as 'Huck's Defeat,' are among the most celebrated in this State, as giving a turning point to the contest of the revolution. General Morgan, who commanded at the Cowpens, was a presbyterian elder, and lived and died in the communion of the church. General Pickens, who made all the arrangements for the battle, was also a presbyterian elder. And nearly all under their command were presbyterians. In the battle of King's Mountain, Colonel Campbell, Colonel James Williams, (who fell in the action,) Colonel Cleaveland, Colonel Shelby, and Colonel Sevier, were all presbyterian elders;

* Rev. J. M. Krebs.

and the body of their troops were collected from presbyterian settlements. At Huck's Defeat, in York, Colonel Bratton and Major Dickson, were both elders of the presbyterian church. Major Samuel Morrow, who was with Colonel Sumpter in four engagements, and at King's Mountain, Blackstock's, and other battles, and whose home was in the army till the termination of hostilities, was, for about fifty years, a ruling elder of the presbyterian church.*

These facts we have collected from high authority, and they deserve to be prominently noticed. Here are ten officers of distinction, all bearing rule in the church of Christ — and all bearing arms in defence of our liberties. Braver and better officers cannot be found in the annals of our country — nor braver or better troops.

It may also be mentioned in this connection, that Marion, Huger, and other distinguished men of revolutionary memory, were of Huguenot, that is, full-blooded presbyterian, descent.

'A presbyterian loyalist,' says Mr. William B. Reed, himself an episcopalian, 'was a thing unheard of. Patriotic clergymen of the established church were exceptions to general conduct; for while they were patriots at a sacrifice, and in spite of restraints and imaginary obligations, which many found it impossible to disregard, it was natural sympathy and voluntary action, that placed the dissenters under the banner of revolutionary redress. It is a sober judgment, which cannot be questioned, that, had independence and its maintenance depended on the approval and ready sanction of the colonial episcopal clergy, misrule and oppression must have become far more intense, before they would have seen a case of justifiable rebellion. The debt of gratitude which independent America owes to the dissenting clergy and laity, never can be paid.'†

* He died in Spartanburgh district, S. C. in Feb. 1842, aged 82.

† Address before the Philomathean Society, Philad. 1838, pp. 59, 60.

CHAPTER IV.

PRESBYTERY MORE REPUBLICAN THAN OTHER FORMS OF CHRISTIAN POLITY.

It remains that we should say something on the comparative claims to the character of republicanism, of our own and other ecclesiastical systems. Comparisons are always odious. We shall, therefore, discharge the incumbent duty now forced upon us, with as much lenity and despatch as truth and justice will admit.

Passing by the minor differences existing between the presbyterian church, *strictly so called*, and other denominations essentially agreeing with it, and who may be properly included under the general term presbytery, we will institute a claim of partial superiority to our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal church; of still greater to the Protestant Episcopal church in these United States; and an entire superiority to the system patronized by the high-church prelatists, and established among *their* Roman Catholic brethren.

In making this comparison, we must bear in mind one rule of simple and unquestionable authority in the premises. To deny the first principles of any system is to deny that system; however, in less important points, there may be agreement with it. ‘The rights of particular nations cannot subsist,’ says Sydney, ‘if general principles, contrary to them, are received as true.’* And in like manner, we must conclude, that ecclesiastical systems, embodying principles contrary to those which are fundamental to republicanism, or which fail to recognise those principles, are in their measure contrary to it, or irreconcilable with it.

* Disc. on Govt. ch. i. § 4.

SECTION I.

The system of presbytery more republican than the polity of the Methodist Episcopal church.

We confess, that in perusing the articles on 'the republicanism of methodist polity,' already referred to,* we were led to entertain a higher opinion of the system, than we had previously cherished. There are many things in which an analogy may be drawn out between methodism and republicanism, and there is much in it adapted to the popular mind. In its *doctrine* of the ministry, it is essentially presbyterian; for while it admits of bishops as superintendents, it teaches that there is but one *ORDER* of ministers, and that these are, in *order*, equal to the rest. To this doctrine it has fully committed itself by the republication, under its own sanction, of the works of Lord King,† and Mr. Powell.‡ Under the name of an office, however, it attributes to its bishops very unlimited powers. And the question, therefore, is, whether this analogy will hold in regard to those principles which are *fundamental* to a republic, and not merely in those which are *secondary* in their importance, or common to it with other forms of government.

Now among the principles which are fundamental to the very existence of a republic we found these.

1. The equality of all its members, implying that the laws are made equally by all, acting through their representatives, and that none are elevated to any station in which they can act or legislate, independently of the people.

* These were first printed in 'The Christian Advocate,' and republished in 'The Southern Christian Advocate.'

† The Primitive Govt. of the Church.

‡ On the Apostolical Succession, which is a thorough presbyterian book.

2. The sovereign power of the people, as the source of all authority; their intervention in all public affairs; their election of all officers; the consequent responsibility of all officers to them for the discharge of their duty, and the management of funds; and their knowledge and control, through their representatives, of all expenditures.

3. The extension of the right of suffrage, in the appointment of officers, to all capable of exercising it, or, in other words, the rights, privileges, and immunities of the laity.

These principles, among others, are essential to constitute any government fully republican. But are these found in the *government and discipline* of the Methodist Episcopal church? We think not; for the people, and a large portion of the clergy, have no participation in the legislative assemblies of the church; the *people* had no voice in the original constitution of the church, although the code of discipline was drawn up and framed by men; the people have no voice in the election, ordination, removal, or dismissal of ministers; the elective and representative rights of the people are therefore denied, and the management of funds in a great measure withdrawn from their control. We do not enter into particulars, although we might in all fairness do so, as, in the articles alluded to, there is a *formal* comparison of methodist polity with presbyterianism, on this very ground of their republican character. We are saved this trouble, however, by the admissions made in some articles on 'the Methodist Church Government,' in 'the Southern Christian Advocate,'* by which it would appear that this system does not base its merits upon its republicanism, but upon other qualities. In reply to the charge of the anti-republican character of this polity, it is there said:

* See Dec. 23, 1842, and Jan. 6, 1843.

‘But may we not reasonably object to have our ecclesiastical system tried by a standard with which it holds no common first principles? And may we not challenge the competency of the court which condemns us, when we find christianity itself subjected to the same condemnation? It is a master-axiom in our republican creed, that the popular will is the source of law. But we find in the statute-book of methodism a system of laws which did not originate in the will of the people. It follows, of course, that methodism is opposed to republicanism.’*

Again the editor says, ‘it is not difficult to dispose of the objections based on such terms as, ‘the equal and inalienable rights of the people’ — ‘supreme legislature of the church’ — ‘rights of methodist laymen,’ and so forth. Here is the methodist church. Its *ministers* have offered to our acceptance doctrines and discipline which *they claim*, not as inventions of their own, but as the commands of Him who has said,’ &c.

Now all this is very well; but a difficult question previously arises; when and where did Christ delegate power to the ministers *alone* to constitute themselves the church, to draw up ‘methodism, doctrine, and discipline, as the clearest and best exposition and summary of what *they* believed to be in the Bible,’ and then to offer this to God’s people, without giving the great mass of the church any possible opportunity of exercising *their* rights in ascertaining what are the principles of the church, as laid down in the scriptures? What is this, but to make these travelling clergy *the church*, and to clothe them with the powers of the whole body of the faithful.

But again the editor says. ‘Now, then, for the question of *rights*. There are natural rights, social rights, civil rights,

* The editor goes on to show, that christianity is equally opposed to republicanism. How far this is the case, we leave our readers to determine. See our remarks in chap. i.

christian rights, methodist rights. In this scale of rights, it will be seen, with half a glance, that social rights interfere to some extent with natural rights; and civil or political rights limit social; christian rights demand surrenders, which civil rights may not claim; and, last of all, methodist rights are limited, and tied down to sacrifices of natural, social, and even christian rights, which are demanded by no other ecclesiastical system.
 . . . And, finally, as a methodist, by the essential conditions of the system, he must, *in limine*, deliberately surrender what, as a christian of some other denomination, he might retain. A man may be a sincere and pious presbyterian, episcopalian, or baptist, and yet be unprepared for the amount of privations and sacrifices, and the surrender of certain privileges, which the methodist church demands.'

Again, 'our itinerant organization renders unnecessary any lay representation, either in the general or the annual conferences. To other churches, constructed on a different organic principle, such a representation may be necessary, for any thing we know to the contrary.'

Again, in proof of the working and success of their system, a contrast is presented between its success and that of the Protestant Methodist church. 'We need only remind the reader, that the Methodist Protestant church, organized specifically and purposely on so-called republican principles, in which a lay representation in the general and annual conferences is a fundamental element, has been in operation some twelve or fourteen years.'

As it regards the rights of the laity, it is also said. 'Now we admit to the full extent, the alleged peculiarity. The constitution of methodism, is such as to demand a relinquishment of the privilege of choosing a pastor. The people actually have no voice in the selection of their spiritual guides. And this peculiarity, so far from being a late discovery, is just as old as methodism. It

has been from the very beginning the main centre of our strength.'

We wage no quarrel with our methodist brethren. They are cut loose from all European influence. They are, we doubt not, '*heart and hand*' republicans in civil matters. They have all right, humanly speaking, to frame their own code of discipline; to restrict its supreme power to their ministry, and to deny it to the people, so long as it shall appear to the people to be for the common advantage of the church that it should be so. And truly they have accomplished wonderful things, for which we are glad. But when our methodist brethren claim comparison with us, and *superiority* to us, *on the ground of the republican character of our respective systems*, we must maintain, that the essential principles of republicanism, before mentioned, are found wanting in the methodist polity, while they are prominent in our own. Neither can we believe, that the *marvellous success* of this denomination is to be attributed to its constitution, so far as it is 'opposed to republicanism,'* but to the zeal, energy, and devoted piety with which they have proclaimed the gospel. And we must believe, that the adaptation of their system to that republican form laid down, as we think, in the scriptures, would immeasurably increase, and not diminish, their power to do good. Thus much we say in all kindness. Neither should we have said any thing, had we not been called upon to do so, by these recent and repeated efforts to produce a contrary impression. With our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal churches we desire to cultivate the kindest relations, and a growing harmony and coöperation in every good word and work.

* See extract at p. 15.

SECTION II.

Presbytery more republican than the Protestant Episcopal church.

We pass on to consider the superiority of the presbyterian polity to that of the Protestant Episcopal church in these United States. Before, however, proceeding to remark upon its present constitution, we feel it but justice to ourselves to make some reference to its past history. And while, we would again say, that nothing can be further from our intention than to impute to the prelates, clergy, or members of the episcopal church in this country, *an anti-republican spirit*, or any want of the most devoted attachment to the interests of the commonwealth; or insincerity in their avowal, that, *as they regard it*, the ecclesiastical polity of their church is in perfect keeping with the genius of republicanism; yet we may be allowed to state, that very opposite views of the necessary tendency of that system have been insisted upon by its ablest advocates. Of this declaration, we will present one pregnant illustration, taken from the work of Doctor Chandler, in which he very ably advocated the then unpopular scheme of an American episcopate. After going through an examination of the religious grounds, upon which the propriety of this scheme was based, he proceeds to show, that considerations of a political nature were of themselves sufficient to decide the question, whether or not bishops should be introduced into America. He says,* ‘But, notwithstanding, episcopacy and monarchy are, in their frame and constitution, best suited to each other. Episcopacy can never thrive in a republican government, nor republican principles in an episcopal

* Appeal on behalf of the Ch. of Eng. in America, N. York, 1767. p. 115.

church. For the same reasons, in a mixed monarchy, no form of ecclesiastical government can so exactly harmonize with the state, as that of a qualified episcopacy. And as they are mutually adapted to each other, so they are mutually introductive of each other. He that prefers monarchy in the state, is more likely to approve of episcopacy in the church, than a rigid republican. On the other hand, he that is for a parity and a popular government in the church, will more easily be led to approve of a similar form of government in the state, how little soever he may suspect it himself. It is not then to be wondered, if our civil rulers have always considered episcopacy as the surest friend of monarchy; and it may reasonably be expected from those in authority, that they will support and assist the church in America, if from no other motives, yet from a regard to the state, with which it has so friendly and close an alliance.*

Until after the revolution there were, it will be recollected, no prelates in this country. On this subject, Bancroft says, 'Priestcraft† did not emigrate; by the steadfast attraction of interest it was retained in the old world; to the forests of America religion came as a companion; the American mind never bowed to an idolatry of forms; and there was not a prelate in the whole English part of the continent.'

We have already had occasion to allude, at some length, to the violent prejudices which universally prevailed against the introduction of prelates into this land of freedom.‡ Bishop White testifies, that so powerful was this prejudice against bishops, that 'it was impossible to have obtained the concurrence of a respectable

* The same argument was urged about the same time, in his letter to Mr. Walpole, on the same subject, by archbishop Secker, (see Crit. Com. on this letter, p. 14,) who says, that there was a kindred connection between episcopacy and monarchy. Letter, p. 25, Com. p. 63.

† Hist. of the United States, vol. ii. p. 453.

‡ See Lect. on Apost. Succ.

number of laymen, in any measure for the obtaining of an American bishop.* And that this prejudice was based partly on an opinion, 'that episcopacy itself was unfriendly to the political principles of our republican governments,' is candidly allowed by the biographer of Bishop White.†

This opposition, which the whole past history of prelacy was sufficient to establish, was by no means confined to other denominations, but was extensively prevalent among episcopalians themselves. Bishop White states, that such were the prejudices, *even of episcopalians*, 'against the name, and much more against the office, of bishop,' that, but for the introduction of the laity into the government of the church, no general organization could

* Mem. of Prot. Episc. Church, p. 48. This is admitted by Doctor Hawks, in his remarks on Canon xxi. of the Episcopal church, where he says. [Constitutions and Canons, p. 215, N. Y. 1841.] 'the effect of the American revolution upon the church had been, to attach to it no small share of odium, and few cared to enrol themselves among the clergy of a communion, small in numbers, and the object also of popular dislike. Prejudice, too, served to perpetuate ignorance of the opinions and views of the Episcopal church, (or, as it was then more usually called, the church of England,) and, without inquiry, many cast a suspicious glance at a church, which was not horror-stricken at the bare thought of the prelatial abomination of bishops, and considered her as nothing less than the legitimate offspring of that naughty mother, the scarlet lady, that sitteth on the seven hills.'

† Dr. Wilson's Mem. p. 93. In illustration of the force of that extreme and bitter prejudice which existed in every portion of the British colonies against the introduction of bishops, the following incident is related in Mr. Blackburne's Critical Commentary on archbishop Secker's Letter to Mr. Walpole. In 1749, Mr. Hooper, one of the Council of Barbadoes, was introduced to bishop Sherlock in London, and after relating an instance of the arbitrary conduct of the commissary, he said, [p. 40.] 'And now, my Lord, will you send a bishop to us, who will have this, and greater powers?' His Lordship answered, 'It is not I that send bishops to America, it is the society for propagating the gospel in foreign parts, who are the movers of this matter.' Mr. Hooper replied, 'I do not care who are the movers, but this I can with confidence assure your Lordship, that if ever a bishop sets foot on our island, the people will toss him into the sea.' On this controversy respecting the American episcopate, some interesting information will be found in Dr. Miller's Life of Dr. Rogers, p. 185, first edition, and an address on the subject, by the convention organized for the purpose of defeating the project, at p. 189.

probably have been formed.* And while this opposition to the episcopate was thus powerful every where, it was peculiarly so in South Carolina. 'Here,' says bishop White, 'most was to be apprehended, an opposition to THE VERY PRINCIPLE OF EPISCOPACY.'† It was, therefore, feared, that the churches in this State would not comply with the invitation to unite in the proposed organization, and 'the danger was' only 'warded off' by a proposal to accompany their compliance with an express proviso, 'THAT THERE WAS TO BE NO BISHOP SETTLED IN THAT STATE.'‡

That episcopalians more generally espoused the British cause, in the revolutionary struggle, than presbyterians, is candidly admitted by bishop White, who says, that of those who were thus inclined, '*a great proportion* were episcopalians.'§ In New England, the episcopal clergy were royalists, almost to a man.|| In being so, they only acted according to their principles; for it had been, up till then, an established maxim, that prelacy and monarchy were collateral terms, and promotive of one another. And we may, without vanity, attribute whatever of a republican and popular character is found in the present constitution of the American Episcopal church, to the indirect influence of presbyterianism.¶ Bishop White's plan for the organization of the church, in 1782, in his 'Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States, Considered,' is obviously drawn from the presbyterian model, and as certainly embodies many of the principles of presbyterianism. And that the introduction of the laity into the councils of the episcopal church, in this country, and to a full represent-

* Mem. of the Prot. Ep. Ch. p. 78.

† Ibid, p. 91.

‡ Ibid, p. 91, and Dalcho's History.

§ Mem. of Prot. Ep. Ch. p. 48. See also the facts stated on pp. 8, 49, 58, 59, 60, 78, 97, 105, 106.

|| See Dr. Lang's Religion and Educ. in Am. pp. 71, 83.

¶ Ibid, pp. 310, 311.

ation in all its courts, was regarded as presbyterian and anti-prelatic, we are well assured.* Its proposal was made a ground of objection, and for this very reason, by the English prelates, when solicited to bestow the episcopate.† His advocacy of this feature of the constitution was also made the foundation of a charge against bishop White, that he ‘entertained a design to set up an episcopacy, on the ground of *presbyterial* and lay authority.’‡ On this account, also, was the plan long opposed by the episcopal influence in the State of Connecticut.§ Bishop Seabury ‘disapproved of submitting the general concerns of the American church to any other than bishops,’|| and regarded the introduction of the laity as ‘INCONGRUOUS TO EVERY IDEA OF EPISCOPAL GOVERNMENT.’¶ This is still the opinion of many members of that church, including all those who are favorable to ‘the antichristian heresy’** of high churchism, or, as it is now termed, Puseyism. There is now in existence, among all such, an actual conspiracy against the rights of the laity, as preserved in this representative feature of the American episcopal church, which is daily strengthening, and which is based upon a deep and conscientious belief of its irreconcilableness with prelatical authority.††

In no case could the character of our church stand out more brightly, than in contrast with the present condition of the prelacy, in reference to this heresy. She is now endangered by the local and jesuitical plottings of many, perhaps a full half, of her professed members, who are determined

* That presbyterians exerted this influence, see stated by Dr. Lang, in *Relig. and Educ. in Amer.* pp. 310, 311.

† White’s *Mem. of Prot. Ep.* Ch. pp. 16, 94.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 82.

§ *Ibid.* pp. 82, 202.

|| *Ibid.* p. 99.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 345.

** The *Churchman’s Monthly Review* so terms it.

†† See the evidence presented in *Lect. on the Apostolic Succ.* pp. 309–312.

to Romanize and unprotestantize her doctrines and spirit. And what can her lay-members — the great staple of the church — what, in this emergency, can they do? They, many of them, weep in secret places, and mourn bitterly for the evil that is coming upon them. But what can they do towards lifting up a standard against this flood of iniquity? Alas! alas! They can do no more, as Charlotte Elizabeth has pitifully expressed it, than ‘drag into open daylight,’ by the aid of the press, the guilty culprits.* No more than this can they effect. And if the heaven leavens the minds of their bishops and clergy, as it is fast doing, they have no other refuge, than the bitterness of unavailing sorrow. And thus it is, that, even in this country, there is, we find, no possibility of lifting a voice or a hand — *in a church capacity* — against those bishops and clergy, who are spreading the infection of this dangerous heresy through the length and breadth of the land.

Even, however, as the constitution of the Episcopal church now stands, there is much that is in contrariety to all the principles of republicanism, as we shall proceed to show. The people are utterly deprived of their elective rights, the pastor being called and retained, in any church, not by the people, but by the vestry, subject to the approbation of the bishop, who may confirm or reject the appointment.† ‘Under this canon,’ says Dr. Hawks, commenting on canon 34th,‡ ‘the bishop must summon all the presbyters belonging to the diocese, and a majority of the whole thus convened, may, with the bishop, decree a separation, and prescribe the terms. This is an instance, remarkable in the legislation of our church, for one feature; it allows to the clergy, *as a class*, the privilege of determining, *as against the laity*, when a brother clergyman has been unjustly or harshly dealt with, by his congregation;

* Peep into No. 90, p. 48.

† Constit. and Canons of Prot. Ep. Ch. by Dr. Hawks, pp. 265, 269, can. 38.

‡ Constit. and Canons of Prot. Ep. Ch. p. 318, can. 34.

and they have, in fixing the terms of separation, the power which, in some instances, they have exercised, of decreeing, that the congregation shall pay to the clergyman a sum of money, as a compensation to him, for the pecuniary loss he sustains, in being driven to a separation by their conduct.'

The whole spiritual government of the church is vested in each pastor, subject to the bishop, to the entire exclusion of the laity, thus recognising the doctrine, that the clergy constitute the church, and that the people have no other province, than that of dutiful obedience to the powers that be. In this way, the fundamental principle of republicanism — the intervention of the people in all public affairs — is overthrown, and the teaching of scripture and primitive antiquity utterly set at nought.* Lay elders, or rulers, in the congregation, chosen by the people, were, in fact, originally designed for the English church, and rejected on the very ground of their republican character and tendency.†

There is, in the episcopal church, no code of discipline, by which the lay members, and 'the *inferior* clergy,' may ascertain and limit the exercise of authority. 'In THE

* 'I know,' says archbishop Whitgift, 'that in the primitive church, they had, in every church, certain seniors, to whom the government of the congregation was committed, but that was before there was any christian prince or magistrate, that openly professed the gospel.'

† Bishop Burnet says, 'There were many learned and pious divines in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, who, being driven beyond sea, had observed the new model, set up in Geneva and other places, for the censuring of scandalous persons, of mixed judicatories of the ministers and *laity*, (called by the bishop a little before, *elders*.) and these, reflecting on the great looseness of life which had universally been complained of in King Edward's time, thought such a platform might be an effectual way for keeping out a return of the like disorders.' The bishop tells also the reason, which induced Elizabeth not to adopt this. 'Lord Burleigh and others, demonstrated to her, that these new models would certainly bring with them a great abatement of her prerogative; since, if the concerns of religion came into popular hands, there would be a power set up, distinct from hers, over which she could have no authority. This she perceived well, and THEREFORE resolved to maintain the ancient government of the church'

church,' says Dr. Hawks,* 'we may be said to have no judicial system. By the constitution, the mode of trying offending clergymen is to be regulated, in each State, by its own rules. Some dioceses *have made no rules at all*. Uniformity, in judicial proceeding, is therefore wanting. But there is a greater evil than this; it is the want of uniformity of interpretation. *Misera est servitas, ubi jus est vagum aut incertum*. Better is it that the law should be interpreted erroneously, so that men may at least have certainty, than that it should be held to mean one thing to-day, and another to-morrow. In vain will any one ask what is the law? No man can say. The convict of Massachusetts, doubting, as well he may, under such circumstances, the propriety of his intended punishment, would fain appeal to some tribunal, competent to adjust conflicting interpretations. But where is such a tribunal? *Nowhere in the church*. If he brings his case, by way of petition, before the general convention, that body has no right, under the constitution, to act as a court of appeals. If (as Ammi Rogers did) he carries it before the house of bishops, as little right have they to sit as judges.'

The laity and '*inferior* clergy,' are therefore at the mercy of the bishop; having no court of appeal, to which they can carry their case, when aggrieved. 'We need,' says Dr. Hawks,† 'a court of appeals, with power, authoritatively and finally, to settle the true interpretation of the constitution and canons, *ut sit finis litium*.'

Bishops, in several respects, are clothed with an absolute power, which is subversive of all liberty, and which characterizes the system a spiritual despotism, though under many present anomalous checks. Thus, bishops are permanent governors, and not elective, and are, therefore, monarchs in their respective dioceses; in perfect

* *Constit. and Canons*, pp. 56, 57.

† *Constit. and Canons*, p. 57.

contrast to the elective governors of our states, and of our union.* While thus despotical in each diocese, the bishops form a senate, oligarchy, or holy alliance of sovereign potentates, in the general convention, and all this *virtute officii*, and not by election.† The bishops constitute also a close corporation, no one being admissible into their body, however elected, without their permission and concurrence.‡ By the doctrine of apostolical succession, it is further taught, that all ecclesiastical authority emanates from these bishops through a line of succession. They are, therefore, hereditary sovereigns. The doctrine of legitimacy, as taught by European politicians, and by which the king or emperor was made the fountain of power, which flowed down in regular hereditary succession, lies at the very root of the apostolic succession. It claims, distinctly and formally, that the headship or sovereignty of Jesus Christ, has been transferred to the apostles, and has flowed down from them through their lineal successors, who are styled *apostolic bishops*. Now this we proclaim to be just as great an usurpation, as if presidents, governors, and judges, &c. were to claim to appoint their successors, and to transfer their power to them. It is a direct

* In an old work, 'The case of the Accommodation Examined,' the writer, in commenting on the greater power of a permanent over a temporary president, remarks, at p. 107, (See also p. 111, where he fully draws out the contrast,) 'What difference lawyers do make, *Inter eum qui jure suo et illum qui beneficio tantum alieno jurisdictionem habet*, and what a latitude of power is by them assigned to the former, which unto the second, for this very cause they make incompetent, is not for one to dip further into, than may conduce for the illustration of common reason. Only, as he who is elected to an ordinary office of fixed presidency, *ad vitam*, may well and truly be said to be *jure suo præses*, whereas the other, who is thereto chosen by a commission, as it were, during pleasure, and no longer, doth by the same rule, *alieno tantum beneficio præsideri*; so, that this fixedness, imported by the *jus suum*, arising from the investiture of the office, doth considerably advance the *Episcopus Præses*, and discriminate him from a moderator, nominate only during pleasure, and absolutely depending upon the *beneplacitum* of his constituent, needeth no further explication.'

† Constit. and Canons, p. 52.

‡ Ibid, p. 305. Can. 32.

usurpation of the sovereignty of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is the only source and fountain of authority in the church.*

Like all despotic kings, the bishops have a negative on all the acts of the general convention, and can thus exercise dominion over any number less than four-fifths of that congress of the churches. 'In the general convention of September, 1789, bishop Seabury, with the churches under his care, came into the union, but not until a change had been made in this article. They made it a condition, that this article should be so modified, as 'to declare explicitly the rights of the bishops, when sitting in a separate house, to originate and propose acts for the concurrence of the other house of convention; and to *negative* such acts proposed by the other house, as they may disapprove.' This modification was agreed to. Finally, in 1808, the change was made, and the words 'unless adhered to by four-fifths of the other house,' were stricken out. The article was then left in its present form, as already set forth. *Thus was a veto given to the house of bishops.* In one of the dioceses, and one only, a canon has been passed, giving the bishop *an absolute veto* on the acts of his own convention. In congress, two thirds may pass a law, notwithstanding it has been returned with the veto of the president. In the diocese alluded to, the veto of the bishop is conclusive, and *a unanimous vote of the convention would not pass the canon.* It is easy to see how the veto power, here, may make the convention a mere body for registering episcopal edicts.†

The bishops, also, in order to dignify their sovereignties, are clothed with the titles becoming imperial grandeur and importance. 'They take their titles from the different civil commonwealths, over which they hold dominion.

* See Duffield's Letters to the Rev. Dr. McCoskry. Letter 13th.

† Constit. and Canons, by Dr. Hawks, pp. 24, 26, 56.

This is a step beyond European prelacy. The English bishops, it has been said, take their titles, not from the countries over which their dioceses extend, but from the cities in which are their palaces and cathedrals. Thus, we have the archbishop of York, not of Yorkshire; the bishop of Chester, not of Cheshire. The catholic archbishop in the United States, is content to add the city of Baltimore to his title, and bishop Fenwick calls himself bishop of Boston, not of Massachusetts. But American episcopacy assumes a loftier soul. The smallest number of episcopal ministers in any one of our States, is seven; the largest, that is, in New York, is two hundred and ninety-seven. We concede the right of these ministers, with their flocks, to put one minister over them all, and to call him their bishop, but how the individual thus appointed becomes bishop of one of our States, we cannot conceive.'

'It is well to consider 'whereunto such things may grow.' From this fashion of adopting titles from our civil commonwealths, taken in connection with the fact, that, by fortuitous circumstances, our national chaplaincies, with few exceptions, are filled by episcopal ministers, it seems to us by no means impossible, that the members of other denominations may yet come to be called, even in this free land, by the odious title of dissenters. We are even now indiscriminately branded as sectarians, and this by a party, which, sixty years ago, felt obliged to send men across the ocean for consecration, in order that their ministry might be perpetuated on this continent.'*

* The (Boston) Christian Register. That these titles are already in extensive circulation, we have proved in Lect. on Apost. Succ. pp. 323, 324, &c. An identity of interest is therefore claimed with England. See Origin and Compil. of the Prayer Book. Philad. 1841. p. 75. What are we to think, when we hear this same American clergyman, in the same work, p. 101, feelingly bewail the inflicted penalty of a nation's wronged, and insulted, and oppressed people, on 'England's first Charles, her martyred king, and England's BEST FRIEND AND BISHOP, her martyred Laud.' See, on the character of Laud, Lond. Christ. Obs. 1837, pp. 175, 381, 407, 518, 837.

In all societies there is a tendency to centralization of power. This is to be obviated only by the formation of several centres and distinct bodies, having a division of power.* This tendency, which is inherent in prelacy, was only held in check in primitive times, 'by the multitude and smallness of dioceses;† and in modern times, by lodging the supreme power in the king and parliament.‡ But, in this country, the dioceses of bishops *are empires*, and there is no check to the rapid centralization of both government and administration in their hands.

The jurisdiction assigned to bishops is found to be correspondent to their sovereignty. No clergyman, however unworthy, can be deposed, but by the bishops.§ They have the *sole* discretionary power of dispensing, in the case of candidates for the ministry, with the knowledge of the Hebrew.|| A candidate for the ministry can only apply for admission to the bishop in whose diocese he may live, and who may have a prejudice against him; nor can he apply to any other bishop for ordination, 'without the permission of the former.'¶ The bishop, too, can refuse orders to any individual whom *he* may judge guilty of contumacy towards him; ** and, if rejected in one diocese, this poor victim of persecution will be probably rejected in all.†† The bishop can even prevent deacons from removing to another diocese, in which they may have a field of labor opened up to them, and thus compel them to remain where they have nothing to do,

* See London Quart. Rev. Dec. 1839, p. 74; and Tocquev. Dem. vol. i. p. 90.

† Ibid, p. 74.

‡ Ibid, pp. 74, 83-85.

§ Constit. and Canons, p. 33, Can. 6.

|| Ibid, p. 140, Can. 9.

¶ Ibid, pp. 130, 142, Can. 9.

** Const. and Canons, p. 164, Can. 12.

†† Ibid, p. 167. See also Wilson's *Sacra Privata*, pp. 221, 235, and Burnet's *Vind. of the Ch. of Scotl.* p. 182, where it is also shown, that bishops are the sole judge of qualifications for orders, and can ordain at discretion and without reasons.

but wait upon his orders.* The bishop may confirm persons who are not presented by the clergyman of any parish, on *account of their unworthiness*; so that a Puseyite bishop may fill the church with impenitent and unconverted men.† This he may do by virtue of another canon, which empowers the bishop to restore an individual, who has been debarred by any clergyman from the communion, at his own good pleasure, if ‘he think fit to restore him, from the insufficiency of the cause assigned by the minister.’ The fearful nature of this power, which *has been* exercised in this country,‡ Dr. Hawks is compelled to admit. He says,§ ‘In the second section of this law, an addition is made which seems to intimate, that the laity are not lightly to be suspected, but, that a clergyman is likely so far to forget his obligations, as solemnly to exclude one of Christ’s children from Christ’s table, on insufficient grounds. There is here a shorter process also pointed out, in which, *without complaint*, and *without inquiry*, the bishop, who, after all, in the investigation of a matter of fact, is no more than any other man and clergyman, with this disadvantage also, that he is placed at a distance from the scene of the transaction, is expected to pronounce *ex-cathedra* upon the case, more righteously and wisely than his brother-clergyman, who was on the spot, and bound by the most solemn of all considerations to judge righteous judgment. Suppose the bishop deems the causes assigned by the repelling clergyman insufficient, and reverses his act. What is the consequence? Not now to speak of its fastening upon the clergyman an enemy, who will feel that he may do much, because he has the bishop on his side, it violates the established rights of the parochial

* Const. and Canons, by Dr. Hawks, pp. 203, 328.

† Ibid, p. 256, Can. 26.

‡ Ibid, p. 368.

§ Ibid, Can. 42, pp. 363, 364, 365, 368.

clergy, and overturns a fixed principle in our ecclesiastical polity. Such a restoration by the bishop, of a repelled communicant, is a virtual trial and condemnation of the clergyman who repelled him. It will be a sad day for the church,' adds Dr. Hawks, 'when the clergy, without the intervention of triers of their own order, may be tried and condemned by the bishop alone. The smallest approach to such an encroachment should be promptly resisted. It is of vast importance to the well-being of the church, to preserve their just rights to that large body of real operatives, the parochial clergy. Power always passes slowly and silently, and without much notice, from the hands of the many to the few; and all history shows, that ecclesiastical domination grows up by little and little. Give to bishops the right, without a formal trial by their peers, virtually to condemn presbyters in one case; and it will surely come to pass, that the day will be seen when precedent will be cited for it in *all cases*. Antiquity, not primitive and genuine antiquity, for that a wise man will respect, but manufactured within a few hundred years, will be lugged in, and held up as the only guide in ecclesiastical legislation, without remembering, that even pure antiquity must often yield to the altered state of society; and then come canons to bolster up the pilfered power, the spurious antiquity, until the bold usurpation has fenced itself round with a wall, which even truth may long assault in vain. The overwhelming tyranny, from which the reformation freed the protestant church, grew up by this *paulatim* process.' Does not Dr. Hawks here designedly picture the present rapid growth of this prelati cal power?

The bishop may further prevent any congregation from settling the minister chosen for them, by their vestry.* The bishop, therefore, is, in reality, THE GRAND PATRON

* Const. and Canons, p. 279, Can. 30.

of all the churches in his diocese, which are thus in his gift.* And, supposing the existing clergy, or a majority of them, in any diocese, to have become leavened with the high-church heresy, there is no possibility of any reformation, if the powers secured to the bishop are rigidly exercised, since no minister can preach in any other church than his own without leave, nor can any new church be built without similar license.† A man, too, when once made bishop, and when he has thus received the indelible, invisible mark of episcopal grace, is absolutely shut up to the necessity of continuing in office, however unworthy, or unfit, he may prove or find himself to be.‡ The bishop *alone* can displace ministers, and separate a useful, holy, and evangelical clergyman from a loving people, as has been done in many recent cases in England and Scotland.§ But, further, no degraded minister, however penitent, can ever be restored;|| so that, were this the only church in this country, an injured individual might be thus crushed and destroyed without appeal or remedy.

A bishop can exercise his despotic power even over a minister connected with another diocese, who may be on a visit to his own. Such a minister, should he dare to preach, or otherwise attempt to do good, in any way which may be deemed by the bishop to be improper, or contrary to rule, ‘the bishop may, *upon probable cause*,¶

* Constit. and Canons, p. 285.

† Ibid, pp. 293–295.

‡ Ibid, pp. 301, 303. ‘So far,’ says Dr. Hawks, ‘as our research has extended, this law is without a precedent in the history of the christian church. We may be mistaken, but we believe that ours is the first church in christendom, that ever legislated for the express purpose of preventing episcopal resignations; for this canon prescribes so many restrictions, that the obstacles render it almost impossible for a bishop to lay down his jurisdiction. The matter is one which the practice of the church has heretofore left to be settled between God and the conscience of the bishop; and it may well be questioned, whether it be not best, in all cases, there to leave it.’

§ Ibid, p. 346, Can. 38.

|| Ibid, p. 350.

¶ Constit. and Canons, p. 355, Can. 40.

admonish such a clergyman, and forbid him to officiate in the said diocese. And if, after such prohibition, the said clergyman so officiate, the bishop shall give notice to all the clergy and congregations in said diocese, that the officiating of the said clergyman is, *under any*, and *ALL circumstances*, prohibited; and like notice shall be given to the bishop, or, if there be no bishop, to the standing committee of the diocese to which the clergyman belongs. And such prohibition shall continue in force, *until the bishop of the first-named diocese be satisfied* of the innocence of the said clergyman, or until he be acquitted on trial.' And for what reason is all this tremendous power vested in the hands of a man, who may be a Puseyite heretic, and to whom all efforts to promote pure and undefiled religion may be a criminal offence? Let Doctor Hawks himself answer. 'We must clearly understand,' says he, 'what the offence is for which the visiting clergyman, who has broken a particular canon of another diocese, is tried; he is not called to account so much for the ill consequences, which may result from the breaking of that canon, as he is for violating THE GREAT PRINCIPLE of a due respect for the lawful ecclesiastical authority of the region in which he is sojourning. *Insubordination* is his *crime*, rather than the violation of a particular measure, founded on a particular policy.'

Further,* the bishop of each diocese may compose forms of prayer, or thanksgiving, as the case may require, for extraordinary occasions, and transmit them to each clergyman within his diocese, whose duty it shall be, to use such forms in his church on such occasions. A bishop may thus, as was done not long since, prescribe to protestant clergymen a form of prayer for a sick Roman catholic bishop, to be offered up in the congregations, and in which he is recognised as a *true* bishop of

* Constit. and Canons, p. 386, Can. 387.

the true church, in express contradiction of the homilies,* and by which all the corruptions of popery are unavoidably encouraged, and implicitly approved.

That these principles, which we have now developed, must necessarily lead to intolerance, and that they have already done so in this country, we have abundantly proved elsewhere.† And that the rights and privileges of ‘the laity and inferior clergy,’ will be more and more destroyed, in proportion as the number and influence of the bishops increase, we most fully believe. Already they are very bold. Witness the attack of bishop De Lancey, upon the popular and republican constitution of the board of missions of the episcopal church, which has hitherto been modelled upon the plan of our presbyterian board, by admitting ALL its members to an equal participation in its management. The bishop says, ‘another defect is, that it contains no provision by which the rights and feelings of the bishops in those dioceses, wherein the missionaries of the board labor, are secured against an extraneous influence and interference, on the part of the secretaries of the board, in their correspondence with the missionaries. But a still more serious objection occurs to the present organization, arising out of the relation to it which the bishops of the church are compelled to hold. In the General Theological Seminary, the bishops may, at any time, demand in the board a vote by orders, in which case a concurrence is necessary; and are thus secured against being committed to any measure or opinion, by the force of THE VOTE OF A MAJORITY. That institution,’ he adds, ‘which challenges the love and liberality of every member of the household of faith, that institution is modelled on the *congregational* (that is, presbyterian) platform of placing layman, deacon,

* See Taylor’s *Ancient Christ*. vol. ii. part viii. where this is fully shown.

† Lect. on the *Apost. Succ.* Lect. xiii. p. 299, &c.

priest, and bishop, on the arena of debate; where the most skilful, bold, zealous, and fluent, will predominate, and where the opinion of the presiding bishop of the church has no more practical weight, when questions are brought *to a vote*, than that of the youngest deacon or youngest layman, that may happen to be voted into either committee, to fill a vacancy within a week before the meeting of the board. The members of the house of bishops, as a body, are as little disposed as *qualified*, to carry on debates in a popular assembly, and yet, unless they will consent to the exposure and trials of such a scene, they must consent to lose the weight of their sentiments in the board, or to seek peace by surrendering the conduct of the institution to whomsoever will undertake to lead it.*

Surely, if a straw will show which way the wind blows, there is enough in this public declaration to discover the ultimate tendencies of prelacy in this country, and its innate antipathy to republican rights. There is not one essential principle of republicanism which it does not oppose and controvert; — the rights of the people, the equality of all members of the church, in their original character, the church as constituted by the whole people, to whom all power was originally given, the elective and representative rights of the people, the right of the majority to govern and direct the interests of the community, the responsibility of all officers to the people, and the election of all ministers by them, — these, and all the other fundamental principles of republicanism, the constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country entirely overthrows. In no proper sense is it a government of the people, either as it regards parishes, dioceses, or the general convention. The laity are systematically

* Address to the Convention in 1842, in *Charl. Gospel Messenger*, Nov. 1842.

crushed. The little power they *now* have, is regarded as anomalous,* and is constantly diminishing.†

The general government of this church is, therefore, altogether different from that of our republic. It is not a union of *independent* confederated States, it is a *consolidated* government. By the constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, each several diocese surrendered, 'first, such an exercise of independency as would permit them to withdraw from the union at their own pleasure, and without the assent of the other dioceses; secondly, they surrendered the right of having the bishop, whom they might elect, consecrated without the assent of the church at large.'‡ Now, while it is of course impossible to form any union, under any form of government, without surrendering many original and inherent rights, for the sake of other and greater privileges; yet, it will be granted, that the perfection of any government, consists in securing to its members all such advantages, with the least possible sacrifice of their personal rights, or restraint in their free exercise. Now, it is at once apparent, that the rights here said to be surrendered, are very *essential* to freedom and independence, and that their surrender places each member of the confederation in a condition of *necessary dependency* upon all the rest. So much so, indeed, that, while bound to con-

* See Lect. on the Apost. Succ. Lect. xiii.

† Paley adduces, as one of his four arguments for the distinction of orders in the English church, that in them the church, [Works, vol. vi. pp. 95 and 96.] may be considered 'as stationing ministers of religion in the various ranks of civil life. The distinctions of the clergy ought, in some measure, to correspond with the distinctions of lay-society, in order to supply each class of the people with a clergy of their own level and description, with whom they may live and associate upon terms of equality. This reason is not imaginary nor insignificant.'

‡ Dr. Hawks in Constit. of Prot. Epis. Ch. And yet, so badly has bishop McCoskry learned the nature of that sect to which he has given in his blind adherence, that he actually brings forward 'the independence of the several dioceses' as 'analogous to the independence of the several States.' See Duffield on Episcop. p. 52, Appendix.

tinue with them, it cannot, without them, by its own choice, perpetuate its own institutions. The perfect liberty enjoyed by every synod or presbytery, to withdraw from union with the church upon sufficient grounds, and the entire sufficiency of every such body to perpetuate itself, to admit, ordain, and govern its own ministers; and that without any external interference from any other portion of the church, or any subserviency whatever, must therefore be allowed to speak forth the praise of our free and happy presbyterian constitution.

These facts, in the constitution of the protestant episcopal church in this country, drawn from unquestionable sources, we submit, with but little remark, to our readers. They will, doubtless, be as astounding to many, as they were, when first discovered, to ourselves. We had confidently believed, that this church had imbibed much of the free spirit of our presbyterian system. And by its own loud and continual boasting, we had been assured that it was the very perfection of ecclesiastical republicanism. The truth, therefore, should be made known. It will be as mournful to a large portion of that church as it is to ourselves, and may serve to increase that timely watchfulness and jealousy of prelatical encroachments, which will secure the endangered rights of her clerical and lay members.

SECTION III.

The anti-republicanism of high-churchism.

The monarchical and anti-republican character of high-churchism, whether in England or America, needs not a great amount of proof. The Anglican church, 'con-

tinued to be,' says Macauley,* 'for more than a hundred and fifty years, the servile handmaid of monarchy, the steady enemy of public liberty. The divine right of kings, and the duty of passively obeying all their commands, were her favorite tenets. She held them firmly through times of oppression, persecution, and licentiousness; while law was trampled down, while judgment was perverted, while the people were eaten as though they were bread. Once, and but once — for a moment, and but for a moment, when her own dignity and property were touched, she forgot to practice the submission which she had taught.'

Again, he says,† 'The royal prerogative had been magnified to the skies in theological works; the doctrine of passive obedience had been preached from innumerable pulpits. The university of Oxford had sentenced the works of the most moderate constitutionalists to the flames. The accession of a catholic king, the frightful cruelties committed in the west of England, never shook the steady loyalty of the clergy. But did they serve the king for nought?'

This general character of the hierarchy, the whole history of the Anglican prelacy abundantly confirms. The English reformers regarded no form of church government as of divine institution. They chose prelacy, because it was best adapted to a monarchy. In strict conformity to the English parliament, as constituted of lords and commons, the church possessed her two estates in the upper and lower houses of her convocation; the laity, however, being carefully excluded.‡ And as, by its nature, a monarchy requires a supreme head, each prelate was recognised as the one supreme governor in his diocese; and the king as head over all, to whom unquali-

* *Miscellanies*, vol. i. p. 249.

† *Ibid.*, p. 312.

‡ *Dr. Nolan's Cath. Char. of Christ.* pp. 156, 161, 167.

fied submission, from all the members of the church, was required. All spiritual authority, on the part of the church, was, therefore, abjured.* Every canon, however, passed by the church, was absolutely null, till sanctioned by the throne.† And the very highest power possessed by the church, of denouncing under the greater excommunication, was, and is, rendered absolutely void, by a general act of pardon delivered from the throne, without even the formality of an absolution.

And why was it that these principles were allowed to remain in the reformed church of England? No truer reason can be given, than that presented by its advocate, the Rev. F. W. Faber, in his tract on the reformation.‡ ‘Yet how,’ he asks, ‘was the reformation brought about? Entirely by the clergy. The people *never* were consulted in the matter. *No popular* assembly was held. *Nothing was put to vote.* Their consent was never asked. In all probability it would *not have been given*; for the great bulk of the people were too ignorant to understand it, and naturally disinclined to change their opinions. So also, in the catechism, the church teaches her children to obey their spiritual pastors, *and masters.*§’

The act of uniformity, of Elizabeth, was the foundation of the resuscitated Anglican church. Now, by this act, the church was made the tool and agent of arbitrary power|| It entirely subverted all freedom, civil and religious. All toleration was denied, and conformity

* Dr. Nolan’s Cath. Char. of Christ. pp. 160, 161.

† Ibid, p. 163.

‡ No. 151 of Prot. Ep. Tr. Soc. p. 5.

§ ‘Thus we see, adds he, what judgment the reformation would have passed upon congregations censuring the teachings of their pastors from their own private opinions. Still more do we see what it would think of those rude and indecent criticisms, passed by persons wholly unqualified to judge, upon the prayer book, its creeds, and its articles, the length of its services, and the language of its doctrinal statements.’

|| Hence have bishops been of old denominated ‘the prince’s led-horse.’ Life of Melville, ii. 215.

enforced by persecution, and the most dreadful atrocities.*

In the reign of James I, from the period of his apostasy from Calvinism, 'Arminianism,' says Dr. Price,† 'was the badge of a party which advocated the most servile doctrines, both in politics and religion; and had arrayed against it all the patriotism, and much of the learning and piety, of the nation. The house of commons complained of its increase as a public grievance, and coupled it in their remonstrances with popery, as an evil scarcely less to be dreaded. Their aversion to it was fostered by the alliance with civil despotism, into which its professors entered, and they were with difficulty restrained from adopting measures for its suppression. Judging from a partial view of the facts of their own day, they regarded the system of Arminius as incompatible with political freedom; for which it is remarked by Mr. Hallam, 'they had a sort of excuse in the close, though accidental and temporary connection, that subsisted between the partisans of these new speculative tenets and those of arbitrary power; the churchmen, who receded most from Calvinism, being generally the zealots of prerogative. They conceived, also, that those theories, conformable, in the main, to those most countenanced in the church of Rome, might pave the way for that restoration of her faith, which, from so many other quarters, appeared to threaten them.'

The clergy who embraced these tenets, lent themselves to the support of the king's prerogative, with a zeal which entitled them to his patronage.‡ So early as 1606, the convocation drew up a set of canons, deducing

* Brooke's Hist. of Rel. Lib. vol. i. pp. 281, 292, 283 - 286.

† Price's Hist. of Nonconf. vol. i. p. 542.

‡ Price, *ibid.*, p. 547. This was the true reason of James's preference for prelacy. See Dr. McCrie's Life of Melville, vol. i. pp. 156, 264, 271, 304.

the origin of government from the patriarchal regimen of families, and denouncing the more popular and liberal views, which were becoming prevalent. Passive obedience to the reigning monarch is inculcated throughout these canons, and anathemas are liberally pronounced on all who refuse it. The same doctrines were maintained by the higher clergy, during the whole of this reign; towards the close of which, the university of Oxford pronounced a solemn decree, 'that, by the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, it is in no case lawful for subjects to make use of force against their prince, nor to appear offensively or defensively in the field against the king, either upon the score of religion, or any other account whatever.' All doctors, masters, and bachelors of law, and physic, were to subscribe this article; and all persons to be promoted in future to any degree, were further required to take an oath, that they not only at present detested the opposite doctrines, but would always continue to be of the same opinion.*

To what did prelacy lead in Scotland? To what, says McCrie,† it had already led in England, the establishment of the English inquisition, the court of high commission. This arbitrary and despotical court, whose proceedings were regulated by no fixed laws, or forms of justice, had the power of receiving appeals from any ecclesiastical judicatory, of calling before it all persons accused of error, or immorality, and all preachers and teachers, in schools or colleges, charged with speeches which were impertinent,

* Bishop White remarks, that 'in England, Arminianism was conceived of as allied to absolute monarchy, and Calvinism to popular privilege.' [Mem. of Prot. Ep. Ch. p. 55.] See also Dr. Price's Hist. of Non Conf. vol. ii. pp. 9, 29, 241, and, as to Arminianism, pp. 31, 36, 37. See the spirit and conduct of the bishops at the Hampton Court Conference, which were at the same time slavish and blasphemous. McCrie's Life of Melville, vol. ii. pp. 198, 218, 219. This is also affirmed by Dr. Wm. Cook Taylor, in his Biog. of the age of Eliz. vol. ii. p. 56, where he affirms that James had reason for his aphorism, 'no bishop, no king.'

† Life of Melville, ii. 386.

contrary to the established order of the church, or favorable to those who had been confined or banished for contemptuous offences ; and, on finding them guilty, it had power to depose and excommunicate, fine and imprison them. The presence of an archbishop was necessary to the validity of all its meetings, and it was easy for him to summon such associates as were devoted to his will ; so that it was, to all intents and purposes, an episcopal court. As it exalted the bishops far above any prelate that ever was in Scotland, so it put the king in possession of that which long time he had desired, and hunted for, to wit, the royal prerogative, and absolute power to use the bodies and goods of his subjects at his pleasure, without form or process of the common law ; so that our bishops were fit instruments of the overthrow of the freedom and liberty both of the church and realm of Scotland. Bishops became thus lords of parliament, privy-council, session, exchequer, and regality, patrons of benefices, and modifiers of stipends, constant moderators and visitors of presbyteries, and royal high commissioners !

By what means was prelacy introduced into Scotland ? By the very same through which it was maintained in England, and which have been already described.* The way in which it was introduced, says Dr. McCrie,† exhibited a complete contrast to the introduction of the ecclesiastical polity, which it supplanted. Presbytery made its way by the weapons of argument and persuasion, without the aid of civil power, which viewed its progress with a jealous eye, and attempted on more than one occasion to crush it. Its patrons avowed all that they intended, and never had recourse to falsehood or fraud, to accomplish their favorite object. And it had been rooted in the opinions and affections of the nation, long before it obtained a legal establishment. Episcopacy,

* Macauley's *Miscell.* vol. i. p. 312.

† *Life of Melville*, ii. 391-394.

on the contrary, was the creature of the state. It had the whole weight of the authority and influence of the crown, all along, on its side ; and even with this, it could not have prevailed, or maintained its ground, without the aid of those arts to which government has recourse for carrying its worst and most unpopular measures.

‘Deceit and perfidy, and bribery, were joined to fines and imprisonments, and banishments, and the terrors of the gibbet. Dissimulation was the grand engine by which the presbyterian constitution was overthrown. While the court disgraced itself by a series of low and over-reaching tricks, the aspiring clergy plunged themselves into the deepest and most profligate perjury. They refused no pledge which the jealousy of the church courts, awakened by the measures of government, required of them. When engaged in a scheme for overthrowing the established discipline, they renewed the assurances of their inviolable attachment and adherence to it. With the most solemn asseverations and execrations, they disclaimed all intention of bringing prelacy into the church, and swore to observe ‘the caveats,’ enacted to guard against its admission. Every change which was made was declared to be the only one intended ; but, no sooner had the alarm excited by it been allayed, than it was followed by another, until, at last, the whole system of the hierarchy was introduced and established, by the exertions of those who had so frequently disowned and abjured it. It is impossible to find expressions sufficiently strong, in reprobating a scene of deliberate, systematic, and persevering prevarication, and perfidy, to which it will not be easy to find a parallel in the whole history of political intrigue, and which, as practiced by church-men, must have had the most pernicious influence on religion, by debasing the character of its ministers, especially in the estimation of the higher

ranks, whom they now vied with in honors, and sought to supplant in the highest offices of the state.'

Prelacy and monarchy, are, in short, collateral terms. They stand to each other in the relation of cause and effect, of invariable antecedent and consequent. The same principles which led to the extension of the bishop's power over all the pastors of a diocese, led to the establishment of an archbishop, metropolitan, patriarch, and pope, which is a regular monarchical scale. The *spirit* of the system is equally despotic. It makes prelates the depositaries of all grace, the necessary mediators between God and man, the keepers of the human conscience, the only channels of grace, who are clothed with all the prerogatives of heaven. It leads, therefore, to a state of mental servitude, and crouching superstition. It embodies, in fact, the fundamental principles of popery.* And if any man is disposed to regard the connections between popery and despotism, and between prelacy and monarchy, and between presbytery and republicanism, as incidental, we must appeal to their analogous principles, and to their invariable tendencies.†

Hear the description given of prelacy by bishop Hicks, as quoted by the Oxford Tractators.‡ 'Can you, sir, when you consider that bishops are appointed to succeed the apostles, and, like them, to stand in CHRIST's place, and exercise their kingly, priestly, and prophetic office

* See Lect. on Apos. Succ. Lect. xi. xii.

† This connection, as founded upon certain analogous principles, will be found urged by Woodgate, in his Bampton Lectures for 1839, p. 20. See also 349, 350, 351. He contends, that the connection 'is not merely one of analogy, but also of principle,' and on p. 351, 352, he shows the several points of correspondence between democracy and dissent. Huber says, 'the monarchical principle . . . involves the conditions of a natural confederacy with those principles, interests, customs, and peculiarities, which in later times were distinguished as *high-church*, and a natural idiosyncrasy against the opposite religious development.' Die Englischen Universitäten, &c. in Hoffman's Anglo Prussian Bishopric, pp. 27, 28.

‡ Vol. iii. pp. 155, 156.

over their flocks; can you, when you consider this, think it novel, or improper, or uncouth, to call them spiritual princes, and their dioceses principalities, when they have every thing in their office which can denominate a prince? For what is a prince but the chief ruler of a society, that hath authority over the rest to make laws for it, to challenge the obedience of all the members, and all ranks of men in it, and power to coerce them, if they will not obey. And now, sir, I pray you to attend to what follows, and then tell me, if the office of a bishop contains not every thing that is in the definition of a chief or a prince.'

Collier also uses the terms 'monarchically governed,' as equivalent to 'episcopal administration.'*

Hence do we find South, while calling on the civil magistrates to extirpate heresy,† and lauding to the skies, the arbitrary and despotic tyranny of Charles, urging, as a claim for the prelatic government in the church, that it was 'the only one that can consist with the present government of the state.'‡

But, to crown all, and to consummate our argument, 'they are atheists,' says Dr. Nichols, of prelatical memory, 'who affirm that government originates in the people, that this notion is borrowed from the most pestilent atheists, and can be defended on no other than atheistical principles.'§

* Eccl. Hist. B. i. cent. iv. vol. i. p. 26.

† Sermon 3, vol. i. pp. 111, 112, ed. 1737.

‡ Sermon 2, Epistle Ded. p. 76.

§ See in Robinson's Claude's Essay, vol. ii. p. 42. Other testimonies may be seen in Burnet's Vindic. p. 179. Jameson's Cyp. Isot. p. 558. Lord Digby. Lond. Quart. Rev. Dec. 1839, p. 74. Lond. Chr. Obs. 1838, p. 39. Spiritual Despotism, pp. 176, 177, 184, 199, 200, 202, 205, 208, Eng. ed. How this argument entered into all the petitions, arguments, and remonstrances of the prelatical party during the reign of Charles, may be seen in Southey's Book of the Church, ch. xvii. pp. 465, 466, Lond. 4th ed.

SECTION IV.

The anti-republican character of Popery.

Popery is despotism in religion, effected by the suppression of our charter, the holy scriptures, the prostration of private judgment, liberty of conscience, and consequently of all appeal from her unrighteous decisions.* The connection, therefore, between popery and despotic or arbitrary government, is not one of *accident* or *analogy*, but one of *principle* and *necessity*. They not merely resemble each other, they are identical. The *principle* of both is the despotic and servile principle, in the former actuating their rulers, and in the latter those over whom they rule. Master and slave characterize the relation between both parties.

The papacy is that usurpation, by which the primitive and apostolic doctrine and polity of the church have been overturned; so that the pope, who *may* be an infidel, an atheist, and a reprobate, sitteth in the temple of God, that is, the church, as God, and assumes to himself the attributes and prerogatives of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is its only Head. This despotic usurpation, as we have seen, was established in the seventh century, when the authority of the Roman See became predominant in the west, and was consummated in the eleventh century, when that authority became unlimited. Since that time, it has been a mark of orthodoxy, among Romanists, to define the church a monarchy.

Bellarmino, in his lectures ‘De Romano Pontifice,’ delivered in the college of Rome by appointment of pope Gregory XIII, ‘after endeavoring,’ says Cramp,† ‘to prove that simple monarchy is the best form of government, and

* Woodgate’s Bampton Lect. pp. 350, 351.

† Text Book, &c. p. 310.

that therefore it has been adopted in the church, in which the pope, as the successor of Peter, rules in the place of Christ, who has constituted him his sole vicar or representative, describes at large the spiritual and temporal power of the pope.*

That church government ought to be monarchical, Bellarmine further urges, for the following reason,† ‘that, among all the forms of government, simple monarchy, battling some circumstances, is absolutely the best. That however, a monarchy, mixed with aristocracy and democracy, is more useful in this life, than simple monarchy; and that this form of government has prevailed in the church, wherein is the monarchy of the pope, the aristocracy of the bishops, and the democracy of inferior clergy.’ Of the people, we see, he takes no account. They are only subjects, whose province it is to obey.

Cassienus makes it essential to the church to be under one supreme head, nor does he, in his definition, refer to any other governors as necessary.‡ Prelates, therefore, according to Romanists, are not only in a higher degree of superiority to other ministers, but they are as princes of the clergy, while other ministers are subjects, and in all things to be *commanded* by them.§

In 1828, M. Schlegel,|| who has stood foremost among the literary men of Roman Catholic Europe, in his *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, has labored to demonstrate the mutual support which popery and monarchy lend to, and receive from, each other. Church and state, he insists, must always be united; and it is essential to the existence of each, that a pope be at the head of the

* See also Dr. Thorpe, in *Notes of the Ch. Exam.* p. 134.

† *Lib. de Pontif. Rom.* B. i. ch. ix. in Limborch, vol. ii. p. 90S, and *ibid.* B. iii. and iv.

‡ *Syn. Pap.* p. 269, from Bellarm. lib. i. de cleric. c. xiii. xiv. *Videmus Episcopum, proinde verum principem.* c. xiv.

§ *Notes of the Ch. Exam.* p. 187.

|| Dr. Brownlee's *Popery an Enemy to Liberty*, p. 21.

one, and an emperor, absolute of course, at the head of the other. He takes occasion to show, that protestantism is absolutely the enemy of all good government; and that it is, in fact, the ally of republicanism, the source of all distracted Europe's disorders, wars, and distresses. In short, that it is the cause of all the calamities with which the legitimate governments of the old world are now being visited. This cunning politician thus breaks out against our republic: 'The real nursery of all these destructive principles, the revolutionary school for France, and the rest of Europe, has been North America. From that land has the evil spread over many other lands, either by natural contagion, or by arbitrary communication.'*

We do not indulge, therefore, either in conjecture, or in the exercise of *private* judgment, when we say, that POPE-
RY IS MONARCHICAL AND ANTI-REPUBLICAN. We draw upon their own testimony, and appeal to all history. We do this in the knowledge of the fact, that some two or three *dwarfed* republics, or rather aristocracies, have existed in Romish countries. They did so, however, in spite of its influence. They lived by opposition, and the hard maintenance of their envied rights; and while republican *in name*, they were in reality despotic, and without a shadow of popular freedom, or genuine liberty. We do this, too, while perfectly aware that Alexis De Tocqueville has been procured, in utter contrariety to his own principles, to claim for popery the greatest affinity to democracy, that is, as he uses the word, to republicanism. He says,† 'I think that the catholic religion has been erroneously looked upon, as the natural enemy of democracy. Among the various sects of christians, catholicism seems to me, on the contrary, to be one of those which are most favorable to the equality of conditions. In the catholic church, the

* Vol. ii. Lect. xvii. p. 286.

† Democr. in Am. vol. i. pp. 328, 329.

religious community is composed of only two elements; the priest and the people. The priest alone rises above the rank of his flock, and all below him are equal. On doctrinal points, the catholic faith places all human capacities upon the same level; it subjects the wise and the ignorant, the man of genius and the vulgar crowd, to the details of the same creed.'

Now in these remarks, Tocqueville evidently uses the term democracy in the sense of *equality* merely, without respect to *liberty*, and as entirely distinct from it. This is clear, from what he says elsewhere. 'Very great *equality* may be united to institutions more or *less* free, or even to institutions *wholly without freedom*. . . . The taste which men have for liberty, and that which they feel for equality, are, in fact, two *different* things.* Equality, then, is no certain mark of freedom, but may be the badge of slavery. Despotism may produce political equality, but who will say that it can lead to political liberty. We must, therefore, carefully distinguish between equality and freedom. All slaves are equal, but no slaves are free. Freedom is enjoyed only in that community, where the people have an equal right, according to their capacity, to take part in its government.† Equality is found in despotic monarchies, where the monarch is the law, and all beside are equally subject to his will. Now popery, as our author allows, is ecclesiastical despotism — 'an absolute monarchy.' It therefore subjugates all its members to a common level of servile equality, while it equally deprives them all of their ecclesiastical rights, and of all religious freedom. In Romanism there is, we grant, perfect equality, but there is no freedom. In these respects, all its members are equal; they all obey the same laws; they all bow down to the same yoke; they all crouch under the

* Dem. in Am. vol. ii. p. 100.

† Ibid, vol. ii. p. 99.

lash of the same priestly tyranny; they all prostrate their understandings to the same debasing authority; they all submit to the same ignominious penances; they are all alike weak and impotent, in relation to the imperial potentate; and their condition is alike, in contrast with that of their absolute master. This despotism might be compared to the authority of a parent, were it designed to prepare its subjects for manhood; but it is, on the contrary, only adapted to keep them in perpetual childhood, to spare them all the care of thinking, and all the trouble of living, and gradually to rob man of all use of himself. To employ the powerful language of our author,* ‘after having thus successively taken each member of the community in its powerful grasp, and fashioned them at will, the supreme power then extends itself over the whole community. It covers the surface of society with a net-work of small complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the most original minds, and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate, to rise above the crowd. The will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent, and guided; men are seldom forced by it to act, but they are constantly restrained from acting; such a power does not destroy, but it prevents existence; it does not tyrannize, but it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to be nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd.’

But who would not rather incline toward the common empire of the people, than submit to the dominion of a single arm? And is it not better, as Alexis De Tocqueville, when speaking his *free* sentiments, teaches, ‘to be levelled by free institutions than by despotic power?’† Who would not, therefore, prefer presbytery to popery; spirit-

* Vol. ii. p. 339.

† Vol. i. p. 359.

ual republicanism, to spiritual absolutism ; the sovereignty of all, to the absolute power of one ?

Popery is subversive of every principle of republicanism, and irreconcilable with freedom. The theory of those who advocate the divine right of kings, and the duty of passive obedience in all subjects, is embraced in these two propositions, that all government is absolute monarchy, and that no man is born free ;*—and are not these, as we have seen, the cardinal principles of popery ?

Romanism is founded in implicit faith. Now the father of republicanism, Algernon Sydney, will instruct all who have ears to hear, that ‘implicit faith belongs to fools,’ and overthrows reason.†

Romanism requires dependence upon the will and authority of man ;—but this, as the same expounder of republicanism teaches, is slavery.‡ For what is freedom ? ‘It is,’ says Locke,§ ‘a liberty to dispose, and order, as he lists, his person, actions, possessions, and his whole property, within the allowance of those laws under which he is, and therein not to be subject to the arbitrary will of another, but freely follow his own.’ Such liberty, however, popery destroys.

Popery limits the power which inheres in the whole body of the faithful, to the pope, and through his gift, to the priesthood ; and this is usurpation.|| It exercises that power beyond all right or law ; and this is tyranny.¶ By altering the laws of Christ ; by assuming the power of legislation for his church ; by setting up the arbitrary will of the pope in the place of the laws instituted by Christ ; by hindering the church, that is, the body of the faithful, from assembling and acting freely for the com-

* Locke on Gov. ch. i. sect. 2. Wks. 4to. vol. ii. p. 140. Lond. 1777.

† Disc. concerning Govt. ch. i. sect. 3.

‡ Ibid. ch. i. sect. 5.

§ Locke on Govt. ch. vi. sect. 57, vol. ii. p. 239.

|| Ibid. ch. xviii. p. 294.

¶ Ibid.

mon good; and by delivering over the free-born subjects of Christ to a foreign power; popery stands chargeable with having dissolved the government of Christ's church, and setting up one of its own devising.* Rather, perhaps, may it be said to form no government at all, but a pure despotism; since absolute monarchy is inconsistent with every end of human societies, which is the common good of the whole body, and its protection against the unjust power of any.†

Popery crushes the laity, and despoils them of every right. The Romish church is the body of the prelates and priests; the laity have only to pay and obey, in all the passivity of unquestioning submission. 'All Roman Catholics hold, as a doctrine,' says bishop Hughes, 'that the church, (that is, the clergy, to the exclusion of the laity,) inasmuch as it is a visible society . . . has authority to make laws and require obedience to them; (from all men, the world over;) that it has authority to judge in controversies; condemn new doctrines, cast out heretics,' &c.‡ 'With us,' adds this bishop,§ 'doctrines are not made up, as with presbyterians, from the gatherings of the opinions of the people. They are tenets of revelation; they are held and taught as such, and the votes of the people cannot make them *true* or *false*. They were revealed to be taught and believed, and not to be *'coughed down,'* in such assemblies as the late synod of York.' This is the genuine language of proud aristocracy, which regards 'the people' with contempt, as the *ignobile vulgus*.

In this sense, the same champion of despotism admits, 'the Romish church is intolerant as truth.' Now, since the pope and clergy define, interpret, and therefore *make* the truth, without help or hope on the part of the laity, the

* Locke on Govt. ch. xix. pp. 299, 300.

† Ibid, sect. 90, pp. 252, 254.

‡ Bp. Hughes in Discuss. with Dr. Breckinridge, p. 152.

§ Ibid, p. 394.

Romish church is as intolerant as the lust of power and domination, unlimited and unchecked, can possibly make her.* The people are the mere vassals of their priestly rulers. They have no part nor lot in the divine commonwealth. They have no voice in the councils of the church. They have no liberty of choice in the ministers by whom they are to be governed. They have no management even of the funds and property they have themselves contributed to the church. They are now prohibited from acting as trustees of the churches they have erected.† All responsibility to the people for the use made of the funds contributed by them, or the amount received, is denied by popery. The people account to their priests in all cases, the priests to their people in no case. The priests are every thing, the people are nothing. A most singular species of democracy, truly! A glorious equality this, most worthy of the inhabitants of this free republic! POPERY IS THE ANTIPODES OF DEMOCRACY.‡

Popery denies and anathematizes liberty of conscience, liberty of opinion, liberty of the press, liberty of discussion, and liberty of association; and yet, upon these, the whole fabric of civil and religious liberty rests. When the foundations are destroyed, can the superstructure remain? §

* Bishop Hughes, in Discuss. with Dr. Breckinridge, p. 155.

† The London Tablet, a Roman Catholic newspaper, is delighted with the pastoral letter of bishop Hughes of New York on this subject. The Tablet, speaking of bishop Hughes's attack upon the trustee system, says: 'We heartily wish this indefatigable prelate all success in these endeavors of his; and, indeed, it seems likely to attend him. The sensation caused by the atrocious Gibraltar case, in addition to that of New Orleans, is producing precious effects in stirring up a fixed resolution to get rid of that *modern slavery of the Church, called 'lay-trusteeship.'*'

‡ Foreign Conspiracy against the United States, pp. 90, 91, 107.

§ See abundant evidence of these positions, in Dr. Brownlee's Popery the Enemy of Civil Liberty; Foreign Conspiracy against the United States; Breckinridge and Hughes's Discussion, and Our Liberties Defended, New York, 1841. In 1836, John, bishop of New York, publicly condemned a debating society formed among young men of the Romish church in that city. In this, he says, 'The church, in the most positive manner, prohibits all laymen from entering into dispute

The pope is thus absolute and supreme monarch in this land of republicanism, as far as Romanists are concerned. The pope claims by divine right, 'the primacy of jurisdiction, and the plenitude of power,' by which it appertains to him 'to assign pastors to all vacant churches.'* Thus † 'in proud defiance of this free spirit, that stirs in the bosom of every republican and every christian, a foreign despot, residing at Rome, claims, and is actually permitted, by every Roman Catholic in our country, to exercise the pre-

on points of religion with sectarians. '*Inhibemus,*' says pope Alexander IV, '*ne sin quam Laicæ Personæ liceat publice vel privatim de fide Catholica disputare, qui vere contrafecerit excommunicationis laqueo innodetur.*' Had you recollected this sentence, I am sure you would be very far from calling on the catholic young men of this city to become members of a debating society on religious subjects, open to so many serious objections.' John, bishop of New York, in addressing the editor of the Truth Teller, further says, 'I feel surprised that you, who ought to know better, would think of encouraging and drawing public attention to such a society, without first asking the sentiments of your Ordinary on so important a subject.' The bishop quotes pope Alexander IV, to sustain his decree of suppression. The old laws of popery, then, are all allowed to be in force now, and in this country too. Hear the pope: 'We prohibit all lay persons, publicly or privately to dispute concerning the catholic faith; he who shall transgress, let him be hung up (*innodetur*) in the halter (*laqueo*) of excommunication.' This then is the law which governs the Roman Catholics in America. Pope Gregory XVI, in his encyclical letter, Sept. 1832, says, 'and from this most polluted fountain of indifferentism flows that absurd and erroneous sentiment, or rather raving, that *liberty of conscience* is to be asserted and claimed by any one.'

Now the Romanist, who undertook to defend the above bishop's conduct, (see *Our Liberties Defended*, p. 55,) says, 'He concurred with him, pope Gregory XVI, in the views he has expressed.' 'I agree,' says he, 'with him, (the pope,) in considering that the so-called liberty of conscience cannot sufficiently be execrated.' He further says, 'The liberty or rather licentiousness of the press, which the pontiff reprobates, is somewhat analogous to that which the laws of this very state restrain, when they forbid the publication of obscene or demoralizing works.' Indeed; it is admitted, then, that the pope may usurp the *civil power*, and impose civil restraints, in other countries than his own, to destroy the liberty of the press. I did not expect this concession from catholics; and so he acknowledges that the pope does interfere, and contends that he has a right to interfere, in other states than his own, and control the press, and usurp the civil power, and condemn works for their character, just as the legislature of this state passes laws for the same purpose.'

* See his words in *Foreign Conspiracy*, p. 36.

† Brownlee, as above, p. 89.

rogative of selecting and sending hither his own creatures, as bishops, priests, vicars, to take care of the souls of *republicans*.'

We find, also, that in the education of young men for the priesthood, and in all their seminaries, both male and female, there is instilled into the mind an implicit obedience and reverence for ecclesiastical superiors, as a conscientious duty, enjoined by divine authority. Whatever mandates issue from the Vatican at Rome are always faithfully executed, as the commands of duty itself. Whatever these may be, they are taught to believe, that it would be sinful to question the obligation to perform them. By these means, the priests become willing and prompt agents, to carry into effect any plans, without themselves knowing the object of them.*

This slavish subjection to the interests of Rome, is secured by the establishment of celibacy. By forbidding the clergy to marry, they are cut off from all those family ties, WHICH ARE THE FOUNTAINS OF PATRIOTISM, AND THE VERY BOND AND CEMENT OF SOCIETY. Having no interests at stake, they look upon the community in which they sojourn, as their PREY, not as their HOME; and upon obedience to their spiritual governors, as the highest of duties. As soldiers of the pope, they are ever ready to obey his summons, and to execute his commands. Thus the priests, monks, and nuns, compose, in fact, the army of a foreign potentate, to fulfil his high behests, as a religious duty, and to look up to him for promotion, in dignity or office; for in the court of Rome, the pope, being the supreme head of the church, is the sole fountain of honor, as well as of authority.†

But still further to extend this foreign influence, we find that probably two thirds, at least, of the priests in this

* See proofs in *Foreign Conspiracy*, pp. 37 – 39.

† See proofs of this in several examples in *Foreign Conspiracy*, p. 140, &c, Note c.

country, are foreigners : Italians, Spaniards, Belgians, but a major part from Ireland ; who have no natural ties to this country, and have no sentiments or feelings in common with the American citizen. They are ordered to take charge of a congregation, without consulting the members of it ; but are set over them by the authority of the pope. They are commissioned to be their spiritual guides ; to hear confessions ; to grant absolution, and impose penances ; and to administer the last sacrament, which is considered so essential to the consolation of the dying penitent in the Romish faith. Now with all this mighty influence over the minds of American citizens, these men are, many of them, in heart, opposed to our free institutions. My lord bishop Flaget,* of Bardstown, Kentucky, in a letter to his patrons abroad, has this plain hint at an *ulterior political design*, and that no less than the *entire subversion of our republican government*. Speaking of the difficulties and discouragements the catholic missionaries have to contend with, in converting the Indians, the last difficulty in the way, he says, is ‘ their continual traffic among the whites, WHICH CANNOT BE HINDERED AS LONG AS THE REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHALL SUBSIST.’

The Catholic Telegraph, a Roman Catholic Journal, in commenting on the case of the burning of the convent near Boston, says, ‘ this one fact is condemnation of *the system of American institutions*, confirmed lately by numerous other proofs.’ Let republicans hear this.†

In this detestation of our political principles, bishop England, with all his apparent love of liberty, fully concurred. In one of his letters to Ireland, he ventured to write as follows.‡ ‘ How often did I wish my voice could be heard across the deep, proclaiming, at your meetings, what I have seen and heard, since I left you ! A people

* Ibid, p. 75. See all of chap. vii. pp. 6, 73, &c.

† Foreign Conspiracy, pp. 180, 181.

‡ Breckinridge and Hughes's Discussion, p. 376.

valuing freedom, and, in the plenitude of its enjoyment, destroying religion, nay, having nearly effected its destruction, by reducing to practice here the principle which the vetoists and conciliators contend for among you. The Americans are loud in their reprobation of your servile aristocracy, who would degrade religion, by placing its concerns under the control of a king's minister; and could your aristocrats, and place-hunters, view the state of catholicity here, they would inveigh against the democrats, who would degrade religion, by placing its concerns under the control of a mob; and I am perfectly convinced, both are right. In both cases the principle is exactly the same; the mode of carrying it into operation is different. I am convinced, that if those gentlemen of the Irish hierarchy, who are suspected, and I fear with good reason, of being favorable to vetoistical arrangements, had each one month's experience of the operation of the principle here, their good sense, and piety, and zeal for religion, would compel them to suffer inconvenience, rather than commit the fate of the religion of millions under their charge, and myriads yet unborn, to the influence of a most destructive principle, to release themselves and their flock from the mitigated persecution under which they still suffer. . . . The people here, claim, and endeavor to assume, the same power which these classes and conditions would give to the crown amongst you — though not to the same extent. The consequence is, that religion is neglected, degraded, despised, and insulted *with impunity*.' So much for the republicanism of bishop England.

Let it not be forgotten, that the church of Rome is a *state* as well as a church. The pope, who impiously styles himself the 'vicar of Jesus Christ,' claims both *temporal* and spiritual jurisdiction over the whole earth. In proof of this, we shall cite three witnesses out of a multitude, who stand ready to confirm it. One of these is pope Sixtus V. His bull against Henry, king of Navarre, and

the prince of Condé, begins thus: 'The authority given to St. Peter and his successors, by the immense power of the Eternal King, *excels all the powers of earthly kings and princes* — it passes uncontrollable sentence on them all — and if it finds any of them resisting God's ordinance, it takes more severe vengeance of them, casting them down from their thrones, though never so puissant, and tumbling them down to the lowest parts of the earth, as the ministers of aspiring Lucifer.' And then he proceeds — '*We deprive them and their posterity, for ever, of their dominions and kingdoms.*' Our second witness shall be pope Pius V. In his bull against Queen Elizabeth, in which he pretends to absolve all her nobles and subjects from their allegiance to her, he affirms, that God has constituted the Roman pontiff '*prince over all nations and all kingdoms*, that he might pluck up, destroy, dissipate, ruin, plant, and build.' Our third witness shall be pope Boniface VIII. There is a decree of his in the canon law, running thus: — 'We declare, say, define, pronounce it to be of *necessity to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff.*'*

Popery embodies in itself the closest union of church and state.† 'In the Roman states, the same individual holds both civil and ecclesiastical offices. The pope is the king. A cardinal is secretary of state. The consistory of cardinals is the cabinet council, the ministry, and they are viceroys in the provinces. The archbishops are ambassadors to foreign courts. The bishops are judges and magistrates, and the road to preferment to most, if not all the great offices of state, is through the priesthood.‡

* See Address of the Am. Prot. Assoc.

† Foreign Conspir. pp. 90, 177, and Brownlee, as above, p. 125.

‡ Bishop England, in his work 'On the Ceremonies of the Holy Week,' says, (quoted in Breckinridge and Hughes's Discuss. p. 377.) 'In the venerable successor of St. Peter, I behold the former active, zealous, and enlightened prefect of the propaganda, whose deep interest, and laborious exertions, in the concerns of the church of the United States, have been so beneficial.' He calls the company of the cardinals

Nor is this politico-ecclesiastical influence asleep among us. Who are so great politicians as our Romish prelates, priesthood, and laity? Have they not openly interfered with our systems of public school education? Have they not issued their political tickets, and enjoined all Romanists to vote them in? Have they not, by their influence, in some cases, gained their purposes in both these respects? Have they not withdrawn from our public and common orphan asylums, as well as schools, that they may bring up the future citizens of America in all the blindness, bigotry, and superstition of their anti-republican system? Have not the European nations united in a grand society, for the purpose of promoting the diffusion of Romish doctrines, and through them, the destruction of our republican institutions? * Popery is a political system. Its connection with christianity is merely in name, and for the purpose of more completely effectuating its purposes. It proclaims that all power, temporal and spiritual, exists in the pope; that liberty of conscience is a 'raving and most pestilential error;' that it 'execrates and detests the liberty of the press;' that the people have no right or capacity to rule or govern; that liberty of discussion is not to be tolerated; that no responsibility in financial matters is due to the people. It is a union of church and state. It is, in its nature, despotic and anti-republican. Its increase among us is the certain decrease of civil and religious freedom, and its dominance must prove their inevitable ruin. Popery, by its most essential principles, is under the control of a foreign despotic sovereign, who is himself the tool of Austria, which is the

nals, 'the venerable and eminent senate of the christian world,' praises the pope for that very effort against 'liberty,' which breathes through the detestable 'Encyclical Letter,' so repeatedly alluded to in the controversy, (that letter was published Aug. 15th, 1832, and the bishop's book appeared at Rome, March 26, 1833,) and he says, 'that stripping the holy see of its *temporal independence*, would inflict a deep wound on religion.'

* Foreign Conspiracy. See this avowed in Europe, at p. 81.

avowed enemy of all liberty, and to whose despot is committed the superintendence of the operations of popery in this country.*

‘ And yet, the body of our protestant population, whether through ignorance, self-security, or whatever cause, remain indifferent to this subject. While Romanism is establishing its proselyting schools throughout the land, to pervert the tender minds of our youth; and directing its efforts to destroy the religious character and influence of public protestant education; and organizing itself under a foreign priesthood, for direct interference with our political elections; and publishing and circulating the most opprobrious assaults upon the doctrines of our protestant faith; and segregating its adherents into a distinct body, alien in sympathy and interest from the mass of the American people; a large portion of our protestant citizens, who might with ease arrest the progress of these evils, seem unwilling even to be apprized of their existence; and, instead of opposing them, actually contribute of their funds to maintain popish churches, asylums, and seminaries, and commit their children to the tutelage of popish priests and nuns.†

In opposing popery, as thus dangerous to the commonwealth, we do so on political grounds. We quarrel not with the liberty of opinion, as exercised by papists. We would not deny to them a full equality of rights. BUT THEY HAVE MORE. Other denominations have renounced all foreign jurisdiction. But Romanists still adhere to it, in opposition to those constitutional principles, on which our republican government is founded. The subjects of no popish government acknowledge a foreign protestant authority, and yet the citizens of this country are allowed to enjoy all its privileges, while subject to a foreign popish

* For. Conspiracy, pp. 40, 71, 118, 129.

† Address of Am. Prot. Assoc.

authority, independent of their own government. By his spiritual supremacy, the pope assumes the title of God's vicegerent; cancels covenants and promises; annihilates public declarations; arrogates to the paparchy the sole right of interpreting the scriptures; excludes all protestants, heretics, and infidels, from the pale of the church, from all authority to preach the word of God, and from all share in the promises of Christ's kingdom. Now the jurisdiction of such a foreign potentate, with such powers, ecclesiastical and spiritual, *cannot but be* prejudicial, if not ultimately destructive to the liberties of this free commonwealth. This pope refused to establish toleration, even at the urgency of Napoleon.* He thus avouched all the persecuting principles and practices, with which the history of popery is identified. And this pope is the supreme ruler of all the papists in this land. But ought this so to be? If they only are fellow-citizens who are *equally* subject to the same laws, and to the same power, how can they be fellow-citizens in this republic, who owe allegiance to a *foreign* power, and to *foreign* laws, and who CANNOT, until this allegiance is withdrawn, acknowledge the *entire* sovereignty of a free people, or of this government. This was declared to be the case, by the British parliament,† and by our continental congress.‡ It is also the doctrine of Locke, in his celebrated letter on toleration.§ ‘Another more secret evil,’ says he, ‘but more dangerous to the commonwealth, is when men arrogate to themselves, and to those of their own sect, some peculiar prerogative, covered over with a specious show of deceitful words, but in effect opposite to the civil rights of the community. For example, we cannot find any sect that teaches, ex-

* Breckinridge and Hughes's Discussion, p. 373.

† See Burgess's Tracts, p. 257.

‡ Address to the People of Great Britain, Oct. 21, 1774, (in Journals of vol. i. p. 30; in Breckinridge's Discuss. p. 340,) on occasion of the establishment of Romanism in Canada.

§ In Wks. vol. ii. pp. 342, 343.

pressly and openly, that men are not obliged to keep their promise ; that princes may be dethroned by those that differ from them in religion ; or that the dominion of all things belongs only to themselves. For these things, proposed thus nakedly and plainly, would soon draw on them the eye and hand of the magistrate, and awaken all the care of the commonwealth, to a watchfulness against the spreading of so dangerous an evil. But nevertheless we find those that say the same things in other words. What else do they mean, who teach that ‘ faith is not to be kept with heretics ? ’ Their meaning forsooth is, that the privilege of breaking faith belongs unto themselves ; for they declare all that are not of their communion to be heretics, or at least declare them so whensoever they think fit. What can be the meaning of their asserting, that ‘ kings, excommunicated, forfeit their crowns and kingdoms ? ’ It is evident that they thereby arrogate unto themselves the power of deposing kings ; because they challenge the power of excommunication, as the peculiar right of their hierarchy. ‘ That dominion is founded in grace,’ is also an assertion by which those that maintain it, do plainly lay claim to the possession of all things. For they are not so wanting to themselves, as not to believe, or at least as not to profess themselves to be the truly pious and faithful. These, therefore, and the like, who attribute unto the faithful, religious, and orthodox, that is, in plain terms, unto themselves, any peculiar privilege or power above other mortals, in civil concernments ; or who, upon pretence of religion, do challenge any manner of authority over such as are not associated with them in their ecclesiastical communion ; I say these have no right to be tolerated by the magistrate, as neither those that will not own and teach the duty of tolerating all men in matters of mere religion. For what do all these and the like doctrines signify, but that they may, and are ready upon any occasion, to seize the government, and possess themselves

of the estates and fortunes of their fellow-subjects ; and that they only ask leave to be tolerated by the magistrates, so long, until they find themselves strong enough to effect it.'

'*Again*: That church can have no right to be tolerated by the magistrate, which is constituted upon such a bottom, that all those who enter into it, do thereby, ipso facto, deliver themselves up to the protection and service of another prince. For by this means, the magistrate would give way to the settling of a foreign jurisdiction in his own country, and suffer his own people to be listed, as it were, for soldiers, against his own government. Nor does the frivolous and fallacious distinction, between the court and the church, afford any remedy to this inconvenience ; especially when both the one and the other are equally subject to the absolute authority of the same person, who has not only power to persuade the members of his church to whatsoever he lists, either as purely religious, or as in order thereunto ; but can also enjoin it on them on pain of eternal fire. It is ridiculous for any one to profess himself to be a mahometan, only in religion, but in every thing else a faithful subject to a christian magistrate, whilst at the same time, he acknowledges himself bound to yield blind obedience to the mufti of Constantinople ; who is himself entirely obedient to the Ottoman emperor, and frames the feigned oracles of that religion, according to his pleasure. But this mahometan, living amongst christians, would yet more apparently renounce their government, if he acknowledged the same person to be head of his church, who is the supreme magistrate in the state.'

Precisely similar are the views taken of the Romish system, by Milton, in his Tract on Toleration.*

What, we ask, has been the influence of popery in Britain ? Does not history attest that the popish priest-

* Of True Religion, Heresy, Schism, and Toleration, in Wks. vol. iv. pp. 264, 265.

hood were inimical to civilization and education ; that the nation became an easy prey to the Italian court ; and that the clergy, being vassals and agents of Rome, and owning no fealty to their sovereign, were the promoters of tyranny, cruelty, and vice.* And what has been its influence every where ? Let the members of our continental congress, in the Address referred to, answer. ‘ Nor can we suppress our astonishment, that a British parliament should ever consent to establish, in that country, a religion that has deluged your island in blood, and dispersed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder, and rebellion, through every part of the world.’

The testimony of our fathers is still needful ; and will be so, *as long* as the supremacy and infallibility of Rome, continues to be regarded as the centre of the Romish system. So long does it make itself accountable for all the persecution and intolerance, which have hitherto characterized its progress. So long does it stand forth a political and despotic system, under the name of a church. And so long must it be regarded as inimical to all freedom, civil and religious, and to be opposed by all patriots and republicans, of every name, sect, and party. The supremacy and infallibility of Rome, are not articles of faith. They are found in none of the early *creeds*, not to say the Bible. They cannot therefore be essential, even to the religion denominated Romanism. Let them then be abjured. Let Romanists do as other sects have done. We cannot, otherwise, put confidence in ANY declarations, promises, or asseverations, they may make. THE PEOPLE are, we believe, many of them, as *heartily republican*, as are protestants. But they are so *in spite* of their system ; and because, so long as Romanists are a minority, appearances must be kept up, and the people are therefore left as far as possible at liberty. This much is ad-

* See this shown in ‘ England under the Popish Yoke,’ by Rev. C. E. Armstrong, of Oxford.

mitted by Tocqueville himself.* He says, 'if, then, the catholic citizens of the United States are not forcibly led, by the nature of their tenets, to adopt democratic and republican principles, at least they are not necessarily opposed to them; and *their social position, as well as their limited number*, OBLIGES them to adopt these opinions. Most of the catholics are poor, and they have no chance of taking a part in the government, unless it be open to all the citizens. They constitute a minority, and all rights must be respected, in order to insure to THEM the free exercise of their own privileges. These two causes induce them, *unconsciously*, to adopt political doctrines, which they would, perhaps, support with less zeal, *if they were rich and preponderant*.'

To use, then, the words of a true-hearted republican,† we say, 'No! our liberties must be preserved, and we say firmly to the popish bishops and priests among us, give us your declaration of your relation to our civil government. Renounce your foreign allegiance, your allegiance to a foreign sovereign. Let us have your own avowal, in an official manifesto, that the democratic government under which you here live, delights you best. Put your ecclesiastical doings upon as open and popular a footing, as the other sects. Open your books to the people, that they may scrutinize your financial matters, that the people, your own people, may know how much they pay to priests, and how the priests expend their money; that the poorest who is taxed from his hard-earned wages for church dues, and the richest who gives his gold to support your extravagant ceremonies, may equally know that their contributions are not misapplied. Come out and declare your opinion on the liberty of the press, on liberty of conscience, and liberty of opinion. Americans demand it.

* Vol. i. p. 329.

† Foreign Conspiracy, pp. 111, 112.

They are waking up. They have their eyes upon you. Think not the American eagle is asleep. Americans are not Austrians, to be hood-winked by popish tricks. This is a call upon you, you will be obliged soon to regard Nor will they be content with partial, obscure avowals, of republican sentiments in your journals, by insulated priests or even bishops. The American people will require a more serious testimonial of your opinions on these fundamental political points. You have had convocations of bishops at Baltimore. Let us have, at their next assembling, their sentiments on these vital points. Let us have a document, full and explicit, signed by their names; a document that may circulate as well in Austria and Italy, as in America. Ay, a document that may be published 'con permissione,' in the *Diario di Roma*, and be circulated to instruct the faithful in the united church, the church of but one mind, in the sentiments of American democratic bishops on these American principles. Let us see how they will accord with those of his holiness, pope Gregory XVI, in his late encyclical letter! Will popish bishops dare to put forth such a manifesto? We shall see.

•

CHAPTER V.

THE LIBERALITY OF PRESBYTERY.

SECTION I.

True liberality, as distinguished from bigotry and latitudinarianism, explained.

CLOSELY connected with the question of republicanism, is that of liberality. The two things have become, from their inseparable connection, almost identified and synonymous. Republicanism is based upon the exercise of liberality. It follows necessarily, that any ecclesiastical system which lays claim to the character of republicanism, must be able also to establish its liberality. No charges have been more confidently made against presbyterianism, than those of illiberality, bigotry, and exclusiveness,* while the most lofty pretensions to charity, liberality, and comprehensiveness, are continually set forth by other denominations. It may, therefore, be of service to examine this matter, and to offer such observations as our brief limits will admit, in vindication of our most abused and misrepresented church. We are at once willing to admit, that that system of church polity and of doctrine must be most scriptural, which most strongly and most directly tends to foster the holy and heavenly temper of christian charity

i * See of late Dr. How's Vind. of the Prot. Ep. Ch. Newman's Lect. on Roman. p. 195. The Charleston Gospel Messenger, Feb. 1840, p. 368.

and true liberality ; and that the most unscriptural and corrupt, which generates the greatest amount of illiberality and bigoted exclusiveness. ‘ By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one towards another, for love is the fulfilling of the law.’ By their fruits, therefore, ye shall know them.

But there is, perhaps, no subject, except that of liberty, on which more confused and erroneous views prevail, than the subject of liberality. For just as liberty is confounded by many with licentiousness, so is liberality, by many others, confounded with indifference ; and just as in the one case we are conducted to anarchy and the perpetration of every evil work, so are we in the other case brought to the verge of universal skepticism.

True liberality stands equally distinguished from licentiousness or skepticism, and from implicit faith in the teaching of another ; just as true liberty is equally distinct from passive obedience to despotic authority, and from that unbridled independence, which, submitting to no just government or laws, leads necessarily to anarchy and confusion ; or as true liberty of thought, the right and duty of private judgment, is widely separated from that fatalism, which would render the mind a mere machine, under the direction of necessary laws, over which it has no control. Liberality is also to be distinguished from what is improperly termed free thinking, by which the mind is thrown loose upon its own vagrant notions, without the government of any rules, or the direction of any method or order.

And as true liberty is found in the just administration of wise and impartial laws, and in the subjection of every member of the body politic to those laws ; — as our natural liberty is only properly exercised in furtherance of its true end and use, when determined by wise motives ; — and as, further, true freedom of thought consists in thinking justly, in conformity to the real nature of things, and

the evidence before us, and in not yielding to the impulse of mere feeling, passion, or prejudice ; — so in like manner true liberality lies, not in the confounding of all distinction between right and wrong, or in giving equal approbation to truth and error, but in making essential only that which is truly fundamental ; in allowing free difference of opinion in things not clearly essential ; in candidly interpreting the views and professions of those who differ from us ; and in the ratification of the great fundamental principle of all liberty — that in matters of opinion, which do not interfere with the personal or relative rights of men, as members of civil society, men are amenable only to God, and not punishable by one another. In short, true liberality is most comprehensively expressed by the elegant declaration of Augustine, ‘ that in things essential there should be unity ; in things not essential, liberty ; and in all things, charity.’*

But it is important more carefully to analyse the nature and bearings of true liberality. All virtue has been represented as a course of action midway between two extremes or vices, which are the perversions of the truth for contradictory ends. Liberality is thus found to be the safe and middle passage between the Scylla and Charybdis of bigotry and latitudinarianism. Let us then ascertain the bearings and danger of these respectively.

Bigotry is an attachment to certain doctrines, forms, or party, for other reasons than their intrinsic excellence ; and in other measures than is warranted by their importance. It is, therefore, indiscriminating, and generally malicious. Such doctrines, forms, or party, may or may not be in themselves worthy of approbation ; but when they are adhered to without proper regard to the evidence on which they rest, or under the influence of improper

* See Dr. Jibot's Disc. of Free Thinking, falsely so called, in Boyle Lect. Fol. vol. ii. p. 740, &c.

motives, the individual so adhering, is a bigot, and his conduct bigotry. Bigotry therefore implies an obstinate and blind attachment to some particular system; unreasonable zeal and warmth in its defence, and in favor of those who maintain it; and excessive prejudice and illiberality towards those who differ. It gives to such doctrines or forms an undue and extravagant importance, without taking into account other facts and considerations, which ought to be viewed in connection with them. Such doctrines, practices, or forms, may be in themselves correct, or even scriptural, but an importance is attached to them disproportioned to their true value; and consequences deduced from them, and a course of action founded upon them, which are not warranted by a sound understanding, or by any thing in the word of God.* Bigotry, therefore, is so far forth a mental aberration, a species of religious insanity. It possesses its victims with some one subject, and with the advantages and benefits supposed to flow from it, so exclusively, as to prevent the mind from regarding other facts and considerations, which are adapted to remove such erroneous impressions. Like the insane person, the bigot may either form correct data, and then reason incorrectly upon them, or from unsound premises may deduce the most distorted and extravagant inferences. Like him, too, the bigot is blind to all objections, insensible to all difficulties, deaf to all persuasion, and with concentrated energy rushes towards his conclusions, as in themselves certain and inevitable. Like him, too, the bigot reasons plausibly and ingeniously, catching rapidly inci-

* 'Illiberality of mind,' say the Oxford Tractators, (Oxf. Tr. vol. i. pp. 427, 428,) 'in religious matters, bigotry, intolerance, and the like, is the disposition to make unimportant points important, to make them terms of communion, watchwords of parties, and so on.'

'Now the church catholic acts on the principle of insisting on no points but such as are of importance, of judging of opinions variously, according to their respective importance, of acknowledging no parties, and of protesting and witnessing against all party spirit and party dogmas.'

dental and partial relations, and making the worse appear the better reason. In short, certain ideas fix themselves in his mind, to the entire exclusion of all others, or at least from that degree of influence with which they should affect his mind, in his estimate of the true nature of the subject, and of its relation to other truths. Such is bigotry.

But there is a not less dangerous extreme on the other side ; we mean latitudinarianism, or indifference ; and which is the ordinary article found in the market of the world, under the name of liberality. To escape from bigotry, men rush to the opposite extreme, and instead of over-valuing any truths, undervalue all ; put truth and error upon the same footing ; make essential and unessential truths of equal importance ; and thus proclaim the absolute indifference of all opinions, and the equal correctness of all creeds, practices, and sects. Hence has been begotten that monster of modern philosophy — the innocence of error. This boasting pyrrhonism,

Will knit and break religions ; bless the accursed ;
Make the hoar leprosy adored ; exalt heresiarchs ;
And give them title, knee, and approbation,
With martyrs, prophets, and apostles.

This is the ‘ great truth ’ of modern liberality ; or as Junius styles it, ‘ that shameful indifference about the interests of society, (we say truth,) which too many of us profess and call moderation.’ But nothing can be more absurd or impious, than this same idolized liberalism. It is forgotten that even civil liberty and political tolerance, are founded upon, and spring forth from, eternal and immutable truth ; that truth which has triumphed over falsehood, and its hateful offspring, uncharitableness, fire, fagot, and all inquisitorial arguments against the persons of heresiarchs. Society itself, all personal and social rights, all the blessings of civil and religious freedom, depend upon the

maintenance of truth, and the rejection of error. Admit the principle of liberalism in religion, and you have radicalism in politics, and skepticism in every thing, and thus would the axe be laid at the very root of the glorious tree of human happiness. There is — there must be truth, in opposition to error, politically, morally, and religiously. But all truth is necessarily exclusive. It can admit of no compromise with error. Truth and error are the poison and the antidote — the bane and the balm — the weal and the wo, of humanity. It is one thing to exercise liberality towards the *persons* of opponents, and another thing to approve their sentiments. We may tolerate error — we cannot admit its truth. We may refrain from all imputation upon the motives, from all doubt of the sincerity, and from all judgment upon the consciences of others, — and yet have a conscience of our own. We may allow liberty of conscience to our fellow-men, without coming under any obligation to give up our own liberty of conscience. But if we are called upon to regard those opinions which differ diametrically from our own, as correct, we are required to sacrifice our own liberty. A man's belief is a very different affair, when considered in reference to mere temporal matters, from what it is when religion is its subject; whether, in short, we consider it as it regards his fellow men, or his God. On all subjects in which man may be regarded as the author, the speaker, and the inquirer, there is ample room for private judgment, for discussion, and for unlimited diversity of sentiment. But in religion, where God is the Author, and his word the speaker — where there can be but one right standard, and one right interpretation, we are limited by that word; and to be indifferent to it, is either blasphemy or presumption. As it relates to men, belief is beyond their control, or requisition, or penalty, and is the proper object of liberality, of tolerance, of charity, and of kindness, while at the same time it cannot but affect our views of character,

and trust-worthiness, and materially influence us in our choice of friends and companions. Belief, as it relates to God, is, however, altogether different. It is a manifestation of our conduct towards Him — of our regard to his will, whether in the way of opposition or compliance — and of our disposition towards his word, whether we receive or deny it. As it relates to God, we are therefore responsible for our belief, and shall be judged by it. In His sight truth is truth, and error error. He cannot approve the one, or condemn the other.

So far, therefore, as any man is called to act or speak for God, he is at once excluded from all exercise of discretion. He can neither sell, alter, amend, lower, depreciate, or confound the truth. He can neither say more nor less than he finds in the written word of God, as he understands it; leaving however, to all, the exercise of their own understandings in the interpretation of the divine oracles. If the gospel is a scheme of divine mercy and grace, and a system of divinely appointed institutions, then modern catholicism is nothing short of infidelity. It is full of contradictions, and is founded not upon evidence, but upon the want of it. It tends to beget and to diffuse a deistical spirit, wherever it is found.* That abstract general christianity† which is no particular kind of christianity, and which pronounces the unimportance of all points on which any christians have differed, can be only a very thinly-veiled deism,

— still promising

Freedom, itself too sensual to be free,
Poisons life's amities, and cheats the soul
Of faith, and quiet hope, and all that lifts,
And all that soothes the spirit.‡

That there should be among christians unity and love,

* See Dr. Emmons's Wks. vol. i. p. 36.

† See Archbp. Whateley's Charges and other Tracts, p. 464. And Bampton Lect. p. 44. Also his Christ. Indep. of the Civil Power, p. 105. Am. ed.

‡ Coleridge's Poet. Wks. i. 137.

harmony and coöperation, is undeniable. And that the variance among different denominations is attended with lamentable evils, is no less certain. The preservation of union is not, however, the first, greatest, or most important of christian duties — we are required to be ‘first pure.’ One great end of the organization of the church was the preservation of the truth, and the overthrow of error. But if all differences of opinion are immaterial, where is the standard by which christianity is distinguished from deism? And if there is no limit, of what use is the Bible or the institutions of christianity? None at all. The authority of scripture is at once undermined, and its power shaken, when such sentiments are adopted, since ‘contending for the faith,’ though not in the spirit of contention, is a necessary part of christian obligation. So also are zeal, energy, and devotedness; but how can these coexist with a principle that embraces, in the arms of charity, all sects, whether they profess arianism, socinianism, materialism, universalism, or any other creed? Such must be, and such have been, the results of this spirit of liberalism, as is manifest in the present and past condition of the churches in France, in Germany, in New England, and in Ireland.* ‘What do you perceive every where,’ says the Abbé La Mennais,† in the 8th ed. of his *Essay on Indifference*, ‘but a profound indifference as to duties and creeds, with an unbridled love of pleasure and of gold, by means of which any thing can be obtained? All is bought, for all is sold; conscience, honor, religion, opinions, dignities, power, consideration, respect even; a vast shipwreck of all truths,

* So also in Hungary. Speaking of them, Dr. Duncan says, ‘Through the fires of oppression these once famous churches passed, and shone with all the greater spiritual brightness. Now they enjoy greater ease, but the canker of indifference has blasted all their beauty, and well-nigh eaten away the very life—leaving, I fear, in most cases, a political protestantism instead of a living religion.—*Home and For. Miss. Record of the Ch. of Scotl.* 1842, p. 45.

† In *Palmer on the Ch.* vol. i. p. 348.

and all virtues.' 'Atheism,' said Leibnitz, 'will be the last of heresies, and in effect, indifference, which marches in its train, is not a doctrine, for genuine Indifferents deny nothing, affirm nothing; it is not even doubt, for doubt being suspense between contrary probabilities, supposes a previous examination; it is a systematic ignorance, a voluntary sleep of the soul. . . . Such is the hideous and sterile monster which they call indifference. All philosophic theories, all doctrines of impiety have melted and disappeared in this *devouring system*. . . . From this fatal system, *become almost universal*, has resulted, under the name of tolerance, a new sort of temptation.'

To yield up truth, then, is not a moderate, but an immoderate compliance. To compromise in *indifferent* matters is charity and civility; but to do so where the interests of *truth* and *justice* are concerned, is a manifest renunciation both of the one and the other. It is the substitution of the fallible standard of human opinion, for the infallible rule of the divine word.

The truth of any opinion as a doctrine of christianity, depends not upon our view or belief of it, but upon the evidences that it is indeed a revealed doctrine of God;—and the *necessary* character of that truth to the salvation of man, rests upon the proofs that it is revealed, *as such*, in the Bible. As long, therefore, as there is stronger proof for one opinion than its contrary, as a doctrine of the Bible, these two opinions cannot be put upon a level, nor can we regard the one in the same light as the other.

Indolence may lead men to approve what they will not examine or understand; but such commendation is not a virtue, but a vice; while those who persist in error through pride or bigotry, or enmity to the truth, deserve not approbation, but condemnation. Besides, to require indifference to what must be regarded as error, is to render the exercise of charity, that chief christian grace, impossible; for what is charity, but the exercise of forgiveness and al-

lowance towards such as are in fault, and the treating with candor and with personal kindness those whose principles we disapprove?*

Finally, it is not a little demonstrative of its entire insincerity and hypocrisy, that this cry of liberality is found in the mouths of those who, in reference to what makes for their own interest, are most rigorous with their fellow-men. The liberality of such men is only exercised about those things which belong not to themselves, but to God. Now, experience has shown that the most intolerant of all classes of individuals are those who, skeptical themselves, support religion merely on the ground of expediency — that the worst of all fanaticism is the bigotry of unbelief, and that, of all bigots, the worst is the bigot to modern liberality.† As far as principles are concerned, certainly, the latitudinarian is the more likely to be intolerant, and the sincerely conscientious tolerant. A man who is careless about religious sincerity, may clearly see and appreciate the political convenience of religious uniformity; and if he has no religious scruples of his own, he will not be the more likely to be tender of the religious scruples of others; if he is ready himself to profess what he does not believe, he will see no reason why others should not do the same.‡

‘Cruel, then, must that indifference needs be, that shall violate the strict necessity of conscience; merciless and inhuman that free choice and liberty, that shall break asunder the bonds of religion.’§

‘Judge by the fruits it bears, the stately tree, ||
Not by its seeming liberality,
A thing most noble, if ’t is not abused,
May yet be overstrained; thus, now no more,

* See Whateley’s Bampton Lectures, p. 217, 3d ed.

† See Edinb. Rev. Jan. 1837, p. 269.

‡ Whateley’s Kingdom of Christ, Essay i. pp. 48, 49. Eng. ed.

§ Milton’s Prose Wks. vol. i. p. 38.

|| The Deity, a Poem, by T. Wragg. Lond. 1834. 2d ed. p. 291.

Scorned and accounted as a general foe,
Forth from the ambush where he lay concealed,
Stalked Infidelity abroad, unshamed ;
With wily arts deceived the nations long,
Like some huge mountain-torrent, in its course
Widening and overturning, led men on,
Unto the last tremendous battle-field,
Of the Lord God Almighty.'

'At the exact close of the prophetic period,' says Dr. Croly, 'in 1793, the 1260th year from the birth of the papal supremacy, a power, new to all eyes, suddenly started up among the nations ; an Infidel democracy ! France, rending away her ancient robes of royalty and laws, stood before mankind a spectacle of naked crime.

'But persecution had still its work. — All the churches of the republic were closed. All the rites of religion were forbidden. Baptism and the communion were to be administered no more. The seventh day was to be no longer sacred ; but a tenth was substituted ; and on that day a public orator was to read a discourse on the wisdom of atheism. The reign of the demon was resistless. While Voltaire and Marat (infidelity and massacre personified) were raised to the honors of idolatry, the tombs of the kings, warriors, and statesmen of France were torn open, and the relics of men whose names were a national glory, tossed about in the licentious sport of the populace. Immortality was publicly pronounced a dream ; and on the gates of the cemeteries was written, 'death is an eternal sleep !' In this general outburst of frenzy, all the forms and feelings of religion, true or false, were alike trodden under the feet of the multitude. Despotism had been subtle, ambitious, and revengeful ; republics stern and cruel ; democracies wild, capricious, and sanguinary. But there was still a saving principle ; religion was not altogether abjured. But now all religion was abjured ; and as the act was utterly without example, so were the horrors that in-

stantly followed. Vice itself assumed a blacker hue — ‘A hundred thousand heads must fall!’ was the unequivocal principle of the leaders of the state. The fact outran the calculation, and the massacre amounted to millions. The scaffold groaned from morning till night. The leaders themselves were successively swept away in the cataract of blood which they had let loose. Atheism, the last fury of the mind, had brought in anarchy, the last torture of nations.’

That man, therefore, whose own conscience is tender, and his sense of religion deepfelt and sincere, will be, (so far forth,) the more disposed to respect the conscience of another, and to avoid giving occasion to hypocritical professions. His own faith being founded on genuine conviction, he will seek for the genuine conviction of others, and not their forced conformity. He will remember, that ‘the highest truth, if professed by one who believes it not in his heart, is, to him, a lie, and that he sins greatly by professing it.’*

True liberality, then, is not indifference. They are essentially distinct. Indifference, or modern catholicism, consists in looking upon all opinions as equally doubtful, or at least, as equally good. Liberality consists in abstaining from condemning as guilty of evil intention, those who profess opinions which we consider false or pernicious. Therefore, we can have the most ardent zeal for truth, and the most entire tolerance for the persons of those who reject it. We can detest error, and yet cherish him that deceives himself.† We are not obliged, in order to escape from bigotry, to adopt the monstrous conclusion, that religion is altogether a matter of no consequence. True liberality teaches, that religion is a matter between

* Whateley, *ibid*, p. 49.

† See Degerando on Self Educ. p. 71. Whateley’s Bampton Lect. p. 44. Charges and Tracts, p. 463.

each man's own conscience and God — that no one's religious opinions, so long as he does not molest his neighbor's civil rights, ought to interfere with his own;— and that, as *men*, we should employ our conscience to sit in judgment on ourselves, not on our brother; whose religious errors, however great, and scruples, however foolish, should not prevent us from treating him as a good *citizen*, so long as he shows himself qualified and disposed to act as such.

True liberality, therefore, is easily distinguished from bigotry and indifference.* The bigoted man so narrows his mind to the compass of his belief, as to exclude every other object; the *liberal* man directs his views to every object which does not directly interfere with his belief. It is possible for the bigoted and the *liberal* man to have the same faith; but the former mistakes its true object and tendency. Indifference, on the other hand, allows every man to think as he pleases; to despise the opinions of others; to hold nothing sacred but his own conceits; and to accommodate his views to his inclinations. Of all mental aberrations, this boasted freedom is the most obnoxious, as it is fostered by the pride of the heart and the vanity of the imagination. Both bigotry and indifference are the offspring of ignorance; while true liberality is the handmaid of knowledge, and the daughter of truth and charity.†

Patriotism is not a blind attachment to a particular society, nor a hardened indifference to the rights, interests, and welfare of other nations. This sentiment, which, when guided by wisdom and justice, is useful; has, when unrestrained in its intensity, turned states into gangs of robbers; has constituted their mutual fidelity the more dangerous; has aggravated the atrocities of war; and generated the worst of all political evils, the tyranny of na-

* Crabbe's Synonymes, p. 432. Eng. ed.

† See Rennel on Skepticism, pp. 3 - 5.

tions over nations. True patriotism is founded in justice. It breathes the spirit of charity and kindness. It looks with complacency upon the prosperity of others, and seeks for its own country no more than a worthy emulation after whatsoever things are true, pure, and noble.

Now it is equally plain, that the exclusive bigotry which founds its claim to catholicity upon the excommunication of all other churches, or their subjugation to the tyranny of its ecclesiastical uniformity, is not christian patriotism, or the charity and catholicity of the gospel. Enthusiastically attached as are its abettors to the name, they repudiate the reality; and while glorying in their universality, and their privileges, they resemble the Spartans, who, while proclaiming their liberty, were bound by ten thousand absurd restraints, and compelled to talk in a peculiar style, and to assume a peculiar manner. Christian charity is truly liberal in its tolerance of all minor and unessential differences; in its recognition of the rights and privileges of all christian bodies; in hoping the best of all, and thinking evil of none; and in seeking for itself only a preëminence in doctrine, order, and worship, as measured by the divine rule.

SECTION II.

The liberality of the presbyterian church, in her general principles as to the nature of the christian church.

That middle position which we have thus defined, the true christian patriotism, equally removed from exclusive bigotry and from latitudinarian indifference, the Presbyterian Church desires to occupy. She holds the truth but in the spirit of charity; and without condemning other churches as fundamentally false, believes her own to be apostoli-

cal and true. She despises not other churches, and yet does she hold it to be incontrovertibly plain, that her own denomination is to be preferred to all others. 'The presbyterian churches proclaim, as they believe, more gospel truth than many others. They present fewer hindrances in the way to that godliness which is in Christ Jesus, than any others. Their constitution and rules they regard as more consonant to the holy scriptures than any others. Greater restraint can be laid upon scandalous vices and sins by them, than by any other systems; while less opportunity is given for the progress of errors than in other denominations. By these, and similar advantages, the presbyterian church commends herself to the preference of all her members. But while claiming to be more purely scriptural and apostolical, she rejoices in the truth, that 'every church which professes the true *catholic* faith, and imposes only *catholic* terms of communion, and is ready, out of the principles of brotherly love and charity, (that cement of catholic communion,) to communicate with all churches, and to receive all churches to her communion upon these terms, is a truly *catholic* church.'*

Our church distinguishes between the presbyterian church, as a true branch of the catholic visible church, and that universal church. 'The visible church,' says our confession, considered as 'catholic or universal under the gospel, (that is, not confined to one nation as before, under the law,) consists of all those, throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.'† The visible church, spoken of in our confession, is therefore coextensive with the human family, and embraces all of every name, age, and country, who profess the true religion. Our confession goes on to

* Notes of the Ch. Exam. p. 13.

† Conf. of Faith, ch. xxv. § 1.

show, that under this catholic visible church are to be included all ‘particular churches, which are members thereof, and which are more or less pure.’* Far from excluding any branch of the church of Christ from her definition of the catholic visible church, they are all expressly included, as more or less pure; while the only term of communion, which is laid down as essential to a membership in this visible church, is the profession of the true religion.

Beyond this our church could not possibly go; and therefore does she declare, that beyond this universal church, as thus including all who profess the true faith, ‘there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation.’ It is not affirmed, that there is *absolutely* no possible salvation to any others. Neither is it said, that there is no covenanted salvation to any others. All that is taught is, that, so far as the scriptures teach, there is no ordinary possibility of salvation without the knowledge and profession of the true faith.

It is indeed further laid down, that ‘unto this catholic visible church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God;’ but it is not taught that this ministry can consist only of presbyters, ordained by a presbyterian church; or, that these ordinances can be validly administered only by such, and after the manner prescribed in our form of worship. On the contrary, it is most explicitly taught, in the very next chapter of our book,† that ‘all saints that are united to Jesus Christ, their head, by his spirit and by faith . . . have communion in each other’s gifts and graces, . . . are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual services as tend to their mutual edification, . . . which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended

* Ch. xxv. § 4.

† Ch. xxvi. § 1.

unto ALL those, who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.*

In like manner, our church declares, among the preliminary principles of the Form of Government, chapter i. section 1, 'that God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to his word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship; therefore they [the framers of our presbyterian constitution] consider the rights of private judgment, in all matters that respect religion, as universal and unalienable; they do not even wish to see any religious constitution, aided by the civil power, further than may be necessary for protection and security, and, at the same time, be equal and common to all others.'

So far, respecting rights purely civil. In relation to the ecclesiastical rights of religious associations, respecting their own government and discipline, the same chapter continues to say: '2. In perfect consistency with the above principle of common right, every christian church, or union or association of particular churches, is entitled to declare the terms of admission into its communion, and the qualifications of its ministers and members, as well as the whole system of its internal government, which Christ hath appointed. In the exercise of this right, they may notwithstanding err, in making the terms of communion either too lax or too narrow; yet, even in this case, they do not infringe upon the liberty or the rights of others, but only make an improper use of their own.' 3, declares, that our Saviour hath appointed officers in his church to preach, administer the sacraments, and exercise discipline. 4, declares, 'that truth is in order

* This shows the virulent enmity which induces prelatists (such as Dr. How, (see above,) and Romanists, such as bishop Hughes, (see Discussion with Breckinridge, p. 291,) to attempt to confine the above language to professors of the *presbyterian* faith.

to goodness' — 'that no opinion can be more pernicious or absurd, than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence what a man's opinions are' — 'that, on the contrary, there is an inseparable connection between faith and practice, truth and duty. Otherwise it would be of no consequence to discover truth, or to embrace it.' '5. That while, under the conviction of the above principle, they think it necessary to make effectual provision, that all who are admitted as teachers be sound in the faith, they also believe there are truths and forms, respecting which men of good character and principles may differ; and, in all these, they think it the duty, both of private christians and societies, to exercise mutual forbearance towards each other.'

In the Form of Government, chap. ii. the true religion is explained to be 'the holy religion of Christ.' In section 4, it says, 'this catholic church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less, visible; and particular churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed, more or less purely among them.' Section 5. 'The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error, and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of satan.' Section 6. 'There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ; nor can the pope of Rome be in any sense the head thereof, but is that anti-Christ,' &c. In the second chapter in the Form of Government, we are instructed, that 'a particular church consists of a number of professing christians, with their offspring, voluntarily associated together for divine worship and godly living, agreeably to the holy scripture, and submitting to a certain form of government.' There is, in all these teachings, a careful and manifest dis-

inction made between the essentials of a church, and those things which are valuable, so far as they sustain and carry out those essentials, but which, in themselves considered, are not fundamental.

We shall now present a connected view of what we understand to be the purport and practical use of these principles; and, in doing so, we shall employ the language of the Synod of Virginia, in its recent Pastoral Letter to the churches under their care, on intercourse with other denominations of christians.*

‘ *First*, then, we, as a church, claim no sort of civil rights or immunities for ourselves, which we do not claim equally and indiscriminately for all other denominations of christians; and all that we claim of the civil power, and all that we are willing that it should bestow, is equal protection, for us, and all, in the exercise of our religious duties, and the management of our ecclesiastical affairs. In matters purely religious, we hold that every man, and every society, have an absolute and unalienable right to do whatsoever may seem unto them good, so long as they do nothing inconsistent with the rights of others, or dangerous to the peace and good order of civil society.

‘ All denominations of christians are equally entitled to the privilege of associating together, of worshipping God in their own way, of preaching and defending their own doctrines, and of controverting the doctrines of others, whensoever, wheresoever, and howsoever they may choose, provided they trespass not upon the civil rights of others.

‘ Should it so happen, that all the families of a town or neighborhood had for ages belonged to one of our congregations, this would give us no exclusive right to exercise our ministry there. Any man might legally come and

* Adopted, Oct. 15th, 1842, and very generally approved and published.

offer to teach his own doctrines to such as were willing to receive him ; and we could not justly complain of him as a trespasser upon our rights.

‘ But, whilst we profess the doctrine of religious freedom, in its widest sense, we must not confound two things so essentially distinct as the rights which we claim under the law of the land, as members of civil society, and the rules of conduct which Christ prescribes to the members of his church, and to the churches as organized associations. The law of the land necessarily suffers many things to be done with impunity which the moral law condemns, and the gospel declares to be inconsistent with the duties which christians owe to one another.

‘ *Secondly.* We, as a church, concede to others not only the civil, but the ecclesiastical right, to organize themselves under such form of government, and with such rules of discipline, and terms of communion, as they may deem most scriptural and most conducive to their spiritual welfare. The extracts from our standards show, that while we hold some certain form of government to be essential to the existence of a church, which is in its nature an organized society, we do not consider one particular form of government exclusively valid and necessary. We prefer our presbyterian system, as, on the whole, most conformable to the primitive pattern, and most salutary in its practical operation ; but we can freely acknowledge, as sister churches in the kingdom of Jesus, those who adopt the congregational scheme, or the episcopal system of three orders of ministers. We recognise the validity of their ministry and sacraments ; we commune freely with them, not only in our churches, but in theirs, unless excluded by their rules and principles.

‘ You know fully our practice of inviting their ministers into our pulpits, and their members to our communion-table. You know also, that you are at perfect liberty, as presbyterians, to meet with them in their churches, and

to receive the sacrament from the hands of their ministers. Of course, we do not advise you to forsake your own church and ministry, to attend the meetings of others. This would be an absurd and pernicious custom in any denomination, because it would disorganize the church itself, and destroy all settled principles and habits or order in the members. They whose ears are ever itching for novelty, and who run about from church to church, discover a levity and unsteadiness of mind inconsistent with an enlightened faith, and with any sound principles of piety. Far better serve God with settled views, though erroneous in some immaterial points, than be 'unstable as water,' and 'carried about with every wind of doctrine.'*

In addition to the sentiments presented in this paper, another consideration must be added, in order to complete our views of the church. 'The presbyterian church in the United States,' says Dr. Rice,† 'lays very great stress on the terms *voluntarily associated*. During many ages, and in many parts of the world, it has been held, that the *church* possesses authority to compel men to receive her doctrines, and submit to her discipline. This pretension

* A resolution of similar import was passed also within a few years by the Synod of S. C. and Georgia. That these are the views, not merely of the liberal party in our church, but of the 'straitest sect' among us, will be seen from the following quotation from the Baltimore Lit. and Relig. Mag. by Dr. R. J. Breckinridge, for 1840, p. 582. 'THE QUESTION of intercommunion amongst christian denominations is occupying the attention of various conductors of the public press. We beg leave to refer our readers to the January number of this Magazine for the present year, pp. 39-44, where they will find an article headed '*Unity of the Church*,' and signed '*Catholicus*;' in which the whole case is put in a very simple light. That article is a contribution to our pages, by one of the oldest, most admired, and most extensively known ministers of Christ now alive; and we cordially assent to its general principles and spirit. We give its concluding sentence: 'Christians, then, may lawfully associate in separate companies, and under a peculiar regimen, but they may not exclude any of Christ's disciples from his table, and the privileges of his house.' The italics are the author's.

† Evang. Mag. vol. ix. p. 300.

grows naturally out of that transfer of power, which it has been maintained that Jesus Christ made to his church. Hence originated *Acts of Uniformity*, *High Commission*, and *Star Chamber Courts*; the *Inquisition*, with all its infernal apparatus; the stake and the wheel, as instruments of conversion. Hence, too, in the name of the God of mercy, of the most holy and ever blessed Trinity, acts of cruelty have been perpetrated without number, of which fanatical and bloody-minded heathens might well be ashamed. A consideration of this subject, and careful examination of scripture, have convinced the presbyterian church, that it is of unspeakable importance to lay sound principles at the foundation of the christian association; and to let it be seen, that religious liberty, from the very nature of the case, belongs to the members of the church. *They form their society voluntarily.* They maintain, that, 'in respect to God, no person who lives under the sound of the gospel is at liberty to do as he pleases, to embrace the gospel or reject it, as suits his inclination. But in respect to the authority of the church, every man ought, from the nature of the case, to be left to his own will. The reason is, that religion is essentially a matter of choice. It cannot exist in the heart except as it is *chosen*. There is no human power, the exercise of which can cause this choice to be made: there is no human knowledge, which can take cognizance of the heart, and decide on the character of its operations. When the church, then, undertakes to do more than declare the will of Christ, it manifestly undertakes to exercise power which it does not possess.'

SECTION III.

The liberality of the presbyterian church, in her doctrine of the sacraments.

Nor is our church less charitable in the views she gives of the sacraments. Dr. How, and other prelatists, have endeavored to fix upon our church the charge of an exclusiveness as abhorrent as their own. Dr. How affirms,* that ‘the standards of the presbyterial societies expressly declare, that there is no *covenanted* possibility of salvation out of the visible church.’ In substantiation of this position, he quotes the following passage from our Confession of Faith.† ‘The visible church ‡ is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation.’

He further quotes, from the larger catechism, the two following answers:§ ‘A sacrament is a holy ordinance, instituted by Christ *in his church*, to signify, seal, and exhibit unto those that are WITHIN THE COVENANT OF GRACE, the benefits of his mediation; and TO DISTINGUISH THEM FROM THOSE THAT ARE WITHOUT.’ ‘Baptism is not to be administered to any that are OUT OF THE VISIBLE CHURCH, AND SO STRANGERS FROM THE COVENANT OF PROMISE, until they profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to him.’ He then adds:|| ‘The position, that the standards of presbyterial societies confine all covenanted possibility of salvation within the pale of the visible

* Vindic. of the Prot. Ep. Ch. N. York, 1816, p. 22.

† We omit his quotation from the old Scottish Confession of Faith, which never was in any way in force in this country, although it will be equally explained by our remarks.

‡ Vind. of the Prot. Ep. Ch. N. York, 1816, p. 23.

§ Pp. 2, 24, 162, 166. || P. 25.

church, is thus completely established; the passages cited being of so very marked a character, as to leave no room for evasion.'

But this conclusion is founded upon a false view of the doctrine of our standards, upon unfair quotations from them, and upon sophistical reasoning. It is founded upon a false view of the doctrine of our standards. The impression here made upon every reader's mind, is, that in the passages quoted above, the terms 'visible church,' are to be understood of 'the presbyterian church,' and that, therefore, out of it there is no ordinary possibility of salvation. This is plain from what is said by this author further on. 'Pardon and salvation, then, are secured by covenant, to such societies as are founded on presbyterial ordination, and to such only.'*

But from what has been already said as to the doctrine of our standards, concerning the visible church, it will be at once apparent, that this impression is entirely false, since, by the visible church, our church expressly understands 'ALL those, throughout the world, that profess the true religion,' including ALL particular churches, whether more or less pure, and whether prelatical or presbyterian. And therefore does it follow, that it is out of this body, that is, beyond ALL professing christians, that there is no ordinary possibility of salvation, and not out of the presbyterian branch of the church. The sacraments also are here represented as having been given to this catholic visible church, and not to the presbyterian, or to any other branch of it. But for the unfair and partial quotations made by Dr. How, with a design to hide, and thus pervert, the truth, this view of our doctrine would have been manifest unto all men. Nor can his inference be eked out, even from his own most unfair and garbled quotations, but by the most sophistical reasoning. The

* P. 32, in a note, this sentiment is repeated.

whole doctrine of the divine covenants was evidently a mystery to this prelatical advocate, who could conceive of no other covenant, than one conferring *ecclesiastical* privileges upon some *exclusively* favored church. ‘The covenant of grace,’ he would seem never to have heard of.* ‘The covenant of promise,’ was to him an enigma. And our whole doctrine beyond the depth of his theological researches. In order, therefore, to the ‘complete establishment’ of his charge, this redoubted champion of the prelacy, translates ‘*the visible church*,’ — which, we have seen, includes *ALL particular churches*, — by ‘*the presbyterian church*.’ He also renders ‘the covenant of grace,’ (wherein as our standards teach, ‘God freely offereth unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, . . . and promises to give unto *ALL* those that are ordained unto life, his Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe,’†) by — the charter of the presbyterian church. He interprets, thirdly, ‘them that are without,’ that is, without or beyond this covenant of grace, by ‘them that are without the pale of our particular church.’ And, fourthly, he translates ‘*ordinary*,’ (‘no ordinary possibility of salvation,’ &c.) by the *opposite* term of ‘*covenanted*.’ Such absurdities, one would think, must have been designedly put forth, with malice aforethought, since, in the same chapter of our book from which this author quotes, the true nature and *universal reference* of this covenant of grace is most *fully* declared.‡

* See also p. 94.

† Conf. of Faith, ch. vii. § 3.

‡ See sections v. and vi. ‘The covenant of grace was differently administered in the time of the law, and in the time of the gospel; under the law it was administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the paschal lamb, and other types and ordinances, delivered to the people of the Jews, all fore-signifying Christ to come, which were for that time sufficient and efficacious, through the operation of the Spirit, to instruct and build up the elect in faith, in the promised Messiah, by whom they had full remission of sins, and eternal salvation; and is called the Old Testament.’

‘Under the gospel, when Christ the substance was exhibited, the ordinances in which this covenant is dispensed, are the preaching of

SECTION IV.

The liberality of the presbyterian church in her doctrine of ordination.

Not less liberal, as has been seen, is our doctrine of ordination and the christian ministry, since by it the greatest possible charity is extended to all other denominations. That we may not frame it to suit a purpose, let Baxter answer; and let him do so at that time when presbyterianism was most triumphant, and when there was, therefore, least inducement to liberalize our views.* 'Hence it appears,' says he,† 'that ordination is one means, conjunct with divers others, for the designation of right qualified persons, described in the law of Christ, for the reception and exercise of the ministerial office. And that the ends of it are: 1. To take care that the office fail not; and, therefore, to call out fit men to accept it, if modesty or impediments hinder them from offering themselves, or the people from

the word, and the administration of the sacraments of baptism, and the Lord's supper; which, though fewer in number, and administered with more simplicity, and less outward glory, yet in them it is held forth in more fulness, evidence, and spiritual efficacy, to all nations, both Jews and Gentiles; and is called the New Testament. There are not, therefore, two covenants of grace, differing in substance, but one and the same, under various dispensations.'

* The necessity for elucidating this point, will appear from the following quotations. Dr. How frequently asserts, that presbyterians unmercifully unchurch the entire Greek communion, merely on the ground that they allow a single bishop to ordain; (Vind. of the Prot. Ep. Ch. p. 41;) the Quakers, (p. 39,) and in fact the entire church, until the fourth century, when he says ordination by presbyters first prevailed. Mr. Leslie also, in his letter on Episcopacy, [see in The Scholar Armed, vol. i. p. 79,] with that effrontery which seems to have made him reckless, whenever he gave vent to his abhorrence of dissent, ventures to assert as true, that 'the Presbyterian damns the Quaker; the Quaker damns him; Independent, Baptist, &c. all damn one another, and each denies the other's ordination, or call.'

† Disput. on Ch. Govt. Lond. 1659, pp. 148, 149. See also a similar view, at p. 221.

nominating them. 2. To judge, in all ordinary cases, of the fitness of persons to the office, and whether they are such as scripture describeth, and calls out. 3. And to solemnize their admittance, by such an investiture, as when possession of a house is given by a ministerial tradition of a key; or possession of land by ministerial delivery of a twig, and a turf, or as a soldier is listed, a king crowned, marriage solemnized, after consent and title, in order to a more solemn obligation, and plenary possession; such is our ordination.'

'Hence it appeareth, that as the ordainers are not appointed to judge, whether the church shall have ordinances and ministers, or not, (no more than to judge whether we shall have a Christ and heaven, or not,) but who shall be the man; so it is not to the being of the ministry simply, and in all cases, that ordination is necessary, but to the safe being and order of admittance, that the church be not damnified by intruders.'

'Ordination, therefore, is God's orderly and ordinary means of a regular admittance; and to be sought and used where it may be had, (as the solemnizing of marriage.) And it is a sin to neglect it wilfully, and so it is usually necessary, *necessitate præcepti*, and *necessitate mediæ ad ordinem et bene ministerii*, or to the validity or success of our office and ministrations to the church; nor in cases of necessity, when it cannot be had, is it necessary, *necessitate præcepti*, neither. This is plain truth.'

Those persons,* adds Baxter, are orderly and duly separated to the work of the ministry, where there is a separation to the ministry by mutual consent of the person and the flock; and by the approbation and investiture of the first ecclesiastical officers that are to be had, there is an orderly and due separation to the ministry. But all this is to be found in the ordination used in England, and

* Ibid, pp. 221, 223, 227. See similar views in Claude's Def. of the Ref. ii. pp. 230-235, 241.

other reformed churches, without prelates ; therefore, &c. This proves not only the validity of their ordination, but the full regularity.'

Again,* ' We have, moreover, in the ordination of the reformed churches, the approbation and solemn investiture of the fittest ecclesiastical officers that are to be had. And no more is requisite to an orderly admission. There being nothing for man to do, but to determine of the qualified person, and present him to God, to receive the power and obligation from his law ; it is easy to discern, that where all these concur, (the people's election or consent, the determination of fit ecclesiastical officers, and the qualification and consent of the person himself,) there needs no more to the designation of the man. Nor hath God tied the essence of the church or ministry to a certain formality, or to the interest or will of prelates ; nor can any more *ad ordinem* be required, but that a qualified person do enter, by the best and most orderly way that is open to him, in those times and places where he is. And that we have the fittest approvers and ordainers I prove.†

What then, on these principles, is our view of the ministry of other denominations of christians ? ' As baptism,' says Baxter,‡ ' is the open badge of a christian, so ordination is the open badge of a minister ; and therefore, though a man may be a christian before God, without baptism, yet ordinarily he is not a christian before the church without baptism, till he have, by some equivalent profession, given them satisfaction ; and therefore if I knew men to be utterly unbaptized, I would not at first have communion with them as christians. But if they could manifest to me that necessity forbad them, or if it were any mistake and scruple of their consciences, that hindered them from the outward ordinance, and they had, without that ordi-

* Ibid, p. 223.

† Similar are the views of the French presbyterians, as presented by Claude, in his *Def. of the Ref.* vol. ii. pp. 230, 231, 233, 234, 241.

‡ Ibid, pp. 163, 165, 166.

nance, made as public and bold a profession of christianity, and satisfactorily declared themselves to be christians by other means, I would then own them as christians, though with a disowning and reprehension of their error ; even so would I do by a minister. I would not own him as a minister unordained, unless he either showed a necessity that was the cause, or else, (if it were his weakness and mistake,) did manifest by his abilities and fidelity, and the consent and acceptance of the church, that he were truly called : and if he did so, I would own him ; though with a disowning and reproof of his mistake, and omission of so great a duty.'

' There is not a word of God to be found, that makes ordination of absolute necessity to the being of the ministry ; therefore it is not so to be esteemed. The examples of scripture show it to be the regular way, and therefore ordinarily a duty ; but they show not that there is no other way.'

' Objection. By this doctrine you will induce disorder into the church, if all that are able must be ministers, when they are denied ordination ; for then they will be judges of their own abilities, and every brain-sick proud opinionist, will think that there is a necessity of his preaching ; and so we shall have confusion, and ordination will be made contemptible, by pretences of necessity !'

' Answer. 1. God will not have the necessities of men's souls neglected, nor allow us to let men go quietly to damnation, nor have his churches ruined, for fear of occasioning the disorders of other men. It is better that men be disorderly saved, than orderly damned ; and that the church be disorderly preserved, than orderly destroyed ! God will not allow us to suffer every thief and murderer to rob or kill our neighbors, for fear lest by defending them, we occasion men to neglect the magistrate. Nor will he allow us to let men perish in their sickness, if we can help them, for fear of encouraging the ignorant to turn

physicians. 2. 'There is no part of God's service that can be used, without occasion of sin to the perverse; Christ himself is the fall as well as the rising of many; and is a stumbling-stone and rock of offence; and yet not for that to be denied. There is no just and reasonable cause of men's abuse in the doctrine which I here express. 3. True necessity will excuse and justify the unordained before God, for exercising their abilities to his service. But pretended counterfeit necessity will not justify any; and the final judgment is at hand, when all things shall be set straight, and true necessity and counterfeit shall be discerned. 4. Until that day, things will be in some disorder in this world, because there is sin in the world, which is the disorder. But our remedies are these: 1. To teach men their duties truly, and not to lead them into one evil to prevent another, much less to a mischief destructive to men's souls, to prevent disorder. 2. The churches have the power of casting the pretenders (if this case deserve it) out of their communion; and in order thereto, it is not he but they that will be judges. And other remedies we have none till the last day.'

SECTION V.

The objection founded upon the persecuting principles and conduct of presbyterians, answered.

But an overwhelming argument is brought to bear against all these claims to superior liberality, on the ground that the presbyterian church has, in past days, cherished exclusive and persecuting principles, and manifested this spirit in her conduct; and that some presbyterian bodies are still found willing to sanction these

principles.* Now to the truth of both these facts, we grant our reluctant and most sorrowful confession. And while much might be said to palliate the guilt of such intolerance, and to show that in comparison with the course pursued by the papacy and the prelacy, it was fitful, temporary, and partial, while *their* intolerance has been constant, universal, and applied to *opinions* as well as to *forms*; — yet we take refuge in no apology.† We make no excuse. We are rather willing to join in the execration of such principles, and the condemnation of such acts, (so far as facts will show that they were cherished and carried out,) as utterly alien to the spirit of the gospel, and to the genius of presbyterianism. And that *a portion* of the Covenanters should still maintain these views, is a fact inexplicable for its mystery, inexcusable for its absurdity, and unparalleled for its anomaly.

But what have we to do with the conduct of these brethren, with whom, although agreeing in most points, we differ in *this* matter *toto cælo*; with whom we have no ecclesiastical *connection* whatever; and for whose opinions on this subject, *we* are *no more* responsible, than we are, *as christians*, for the corruptions of all those who are called by *that name*. We now advocate the claims, and present

* Dr. How's Vind. of Prot. Ep. Ch. pp. 47, 48, 374, 375. This charge is not seldom also brought against us by congregationalists, who stand in need of a common defence. But that, in former days, they made their views of the constitution of a church an article of faith, appertaining to salvation, may be seen by numerous quotations in Paget's Def. of Presb. Ch. Govt. p. 33. As to the lengths to which they then proceeded, see Bastwick's Utter Routing, &c. Epistle to the Reader. See also the History of their proceedings in New England, as given in Clarke's Hist. of Intolerance, vol. i. Pref. and in all other histories. Dr. Lang's Relig. and Educ. in America, p. 125, &c., where he shows, that 'Cromwell's own clergy,' accepted sequestered benefices of the Church of England. See further, on this subject, from Mr. Lorimer, on p. 232.

This forms the whole strength of bishop Hughes's argument, in proof of the opposition of presbyterianism to civil and religious liberty. See Discussion.

† See Dr. Binney's Dissent not Schism, p. 74, though an Independent.

the sentiments, of 'THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH' of these United States. For on this subject, alterations were found necessary, in order to adapt our standards to the views of our American Zion. We challenge therefore a fair and impartial verdict, and are willing to compare ourselves with any other denomination whatsoever. We do not, for a moment, shrink even from a comparison of presbyterianism, *in general*, with prelacy, *in general*; but in this case we would require, that the *whole* history of prelacy, as developed in the Romish, Anglican, and other churches should be considered; and then the *whole* history of presbytery, as developed in the Waldenses, Paulicians, Culdees, and Scotch, Irish, and American churches should be brought into contrast. In such a comparison, who can doubt the transcendent lustre with which presbytery would outline prelacy. Its most intolerant enactments would appear liberality itself, and its most persecuting doings, the forthgoings of christian charity, when brought into contrast with the bloody annals of councils, canons, decrees, crusades, test acts, acts of uniformity, Bartholomew scenes and massacres, which constitute such an integral portion of prelatical ecclesiastical history.* Our

* Dr. McCrie's Miscell. Wks. Rev. of the Life of Owen. See also presbyterians vindicated from all serious persecution, in Lorimer's Manual of Presbytery, p. 230. The writer says, 'The congregationalists, then, have nothing in point of *practice* of which to boast, over their presbyterian brethren; and in regard to their earlier holding sound *theoretical* views of toleration and religious liberty, the same great historical authority shows, that as correct sentiments were entertained from a much earlier date, by the reformers and first puritans, who were presbyterian; that, soon after the reformation, the same views were common among the presbyterians of Holland and France; that it was not the principles of the sectaries, but of the reformers and their successors, which lay, and still lie, at the foundation of British freedom, civil and religious; that the writings of leading independents, at the period referred to, betray decided symptoms of intolerance and persecution; and that it was the extravagant and most injurious proceedings of many of the sectaries, which, by driving matters to extremities in England, created a reaction — lost all the immense advantages of a sound, civil, and ecclesiastical reformation — destroyed the monarch, and recalled persecution, with its horrors, under Charles II.'

'Had this little work not already exceeded the limits which were

present concern, however, is with the presbyterian church, as known in the standards of our American General Assemblies, both old and new school, as compared with the prelatical communion, either Romish or Protestant. The only proper parallel in this case, therefore, is the constitution and principles of our own particular church, in comparison with theirs, and not of all who may bear our name.

Now from the extracts already presented, it must be manifest that there can be no greater liberality, nor any protest against both the spirit, principles, and practice of intolerance, more powerful than that delivered in the standards of our church. In addition to what has been adduced from them, let the following be considered. Chapter xx. of our Confession of Faith, is on 'Christian

originally intended, it would not be difficult to vindicate the presbyterians from any serious charge of persecution, in connection with the signing of the 'Solemn League and Covenant,' and kindred subjects. It could be shown, from the testimony of such men as Henderson, Dickson, Cant, and Lord Loudon, that men were not forced to take the covenant, or punished for refusal; that any cases of this kind were rare and unauthorized; that the league was most cordially embraced, without any compulsion from church or state, by the great body of the nation; and that any *undue* influence was chiefly employed *against* the covenant. It could be shown, also, from the exhortations of the Westminster Assembly, and the speeches of such members as Coleman, Caryl, Palmer, Thorowgood, &c., that they disapproved of the propagation of religion by force, and that it was mainly the seditious-political, and not the erroneous-religious, against which their exertions were directed, and which gave to their sentiments and proceedings the air of persecution. The case is correctly stated by 'the Reformed Presbytery,' in their Explanation and Defence of Terms of Communion in 1801. 'If any otherwise peaceable and inoffensive subjects, in church and state, had religious scruples in their own mind, both the open doctrine and uniform practice of our pious ancestors recommended all possible tenderness in laboring to have them removed. But, on the other hand, when cruel popish factions, under the fair pretence of only claiming a liberty to serve God in their own way, were plotting the utter ruin of both church and state, and seeking the overthrow of all laws, human and divine; in such a case, indeed, they could not help thinking, that salutary restraint, and well-regulated coercion, were indispensably necessary. And what nation under heaven, properly consulting her own safety and happiness, in time of danger, would not find it advisable to act on the same great principle?'

Liberty and Liberty of Conscience.’ In this it is taught,* ‘God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in any thing contrary to his word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments, out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience and reason also.’

Again, in chapter xxiii. ‘of the civil magistrate,’ it is declared, ‘civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the word and sacraments; or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven; or in the least interfere in matters of faith. Yet, as nursing-fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of christians above the rest, in such a manner, that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free, and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions without violence or danger. And as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in his church, no law of any commonwealth should interfere with, let, or hinder, the due exercise thereof, among the voluntary members of *any* denomination of christians, according to their own profession and belief. It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such an effectual manner, as that no person be suffered, either upon pretence of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse, or injury, to any other person whatsoever; and to take order, that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance.’

‘It is the duty of the people to pray for magistrates, to honor their persons, to pay them tribute and other dues,

* § 2, p. 109.

to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority, for conscience' sake. Infidelity or indifference in religion, doth not make void the magistrate's just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to him; from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted; much less hath the pope any power or jurisdiction over them in their dominions, or over any of their people; and least of all, to deprive them of their dominions or lives, if he shall judge them to be heretics, or upon any other pretence whatsoever.'

So also in Form of Government, chapter i. section 1, as quoted above,* and in chapter viii. section 2, where, speaking of all our ecclesiastical courts, it teaches, 'These assemblies ought not to possess any civil jurisdiction, nor to inflict any civil penalties. Their power is wholly moral or spiritual, and that only ministerial and declarative.'

To this let me add the following extracts from 'An Ecclesiastical Catechism of the Presbyterian Church,' by the author, which has been approved by various portions of our church, and by some of its leading divines:† In chapter v. section 1, 'Of the nature of church power,' it is asked, 'Is the power which church officers possess, such as to affect the civil interests of men?'

'No; it is altogether ecclesiastical; and such as to affect men only in their relation to the church, and to God.'

'How else may you describe this power of the church? It is spiritual, and addressed to the consciences of those who are subject to it.'

'Have church officers any power or authority, even in ecclesiastical matters, independently, or in themselves considered? None whatever — they act altogether ministerially.'

'Do presbyterians, in our country, ascribe any power to the church, which interferes with the authorities of the

* See p. 218.

† A third edition has been called for.

state? No; presbyterians maintain, that the church is independent of the state, and distinct from it, in its laws, its administrations, and its objects; and that it is governed by its own laws, which are purely spiritual.'

'Do presbyterians in our country, desire, then, any alliance between their church and the state? On the contrary, they believe, that any such alliance ever has been, and ever will be, equally injurious to the state and to the church; and that it is to be deprecated by every christian, as the baneful source of corruption and intolerance.*'

Let any man candidly study these passages, in connection with the constitution of this freest and most liberal of all governments, and will he not say that they are, in spirit, perfectly the same, and that, in the principles delivered in

* The only portions of our standards, besides the doctrines of election and predestination, which bishop Hughes could pervert to a sense opposite to civil and religious liberty, is the explanation given of the Second Commandment, (Breckinridge and Hughes's Discussion, pp. 318, 344, 372,) which, among other things, is said to require '*the disapproving, detesting, opposing, all false worship; and, according to each one's place and calling, removing it, and all monuments of idolatry.*' 'If I understand the reasoning,' says Dr. Breckinridge, 'he means to charge us with holding, that *force* of some kind is a duty; or that some *method* of '*removing the monuments of idolatry,*' at war with the rights of others, is expressed. For I suppose he will not say, that if we *oppose false worship*, and remove these *monuments of idolatry*, in a constitutional way, and *without* disturbing the rights of others, this would be *wrong*, or *against* liberty, civil or religious.' 'He will not say that it is persecution, to oppose idolatry by discussion, moral influence, and prayer. The question then is, as to the *manner of doing it*. Does our doctrine utter or imply tyranny, or force, or a hindrance to the free exercise of religious worship? If so, we should like to know it. So far is this from being the fact, that he has himself owned, '*that the Confession of Faith was amended, (at the adoption of the American Constitution,) to suit the constitution and the new order of things.*' What he thus admits (as '*an amendment,*') to be true, may be easily shown, by reference to all those parts of our standards, which relate to the freedom of worship, and the use of force, by the civil magistrate, in matters of conscience.

'Yet it is not said of *our* particular church, but of all christian denominations, that the civil magistrate should protect them. Religion is one of our *common* rights—and a *civil right* to be protected in it. But Mr. Hughes replies, this '*excludes us idolaters.*' No. We say '*all religious* and ecclesiastical assemblies,' are to be '*protected,*' though it be an antichristian system. But shall we, for this reason, be *silent* about their errors? May we not use the liberty of speech?'

these standards, our puritan fathers found the germs, the elements, of that perfect civil and religious liberty, which every citizen of this great republic equally enjoys. Real liberality cannot possibly coexist with any system which does not recognise the principle, that individual conviction is the only worthy basis of true faith, and the consequent right and duty of private judgment. In this doctrine, the very essence of real liberality, both political and religious, is involved. It is when this principle is received as an *axiomatic truth*, that the exercise of such liberality is not, (as it is too often represented,) of the nature of a *lenient indulgence*, or a *benevolent concession*, but stands forth, not on the ground of concession, but of principle, — not of indulgence, but of right, — not of favor, but of justice, — not of compromise, but of steadfast maintenance of the truth, — each upholding what he believes right, without denouncing the other as wrong; all uniting for objects in which they agree, without compromising one point in which they differ.*

Now, as interpreted in our standards, christianity sanctions and does not destroy this freedom; elevates and does not dethrone reason; encourages and does not fetter inquiry; secures and does not withhold liberty of conscience; since it enforces only a *voluntary* subjection to its requirements. It is the doctrine of Bossuet, and the church to which he belongs, and not the doctrine of the presbyterian church, that ‘all attachment to private judgment is heresy, it being the property of a heretic to have a particular opinion.’† And as this doctrine has been shown to lie at the very foundation of American republicanism, ‡ in connection with the entire severance of politics and religion, of civil and religious matters, the absurdity of the charge

* Prof. Powell, of Oxf. on State Educ. Lond. 1840, pp. 81, 82.

† Variations of Prot. vol. i. p. 17.

‡ Tocqueville's Democ. in Am.

of any connivance at intolerance, as made against our church, is as great as if alleged against the Constitution of the United States itself.

SECTION VI.

The presbyterian church is at once liberal and orthodox.

The presbyterian church does not found her claims to the character of liberality upon an *indiscriminate approval* of all doctrinal opinions, or to the Erastian destruction of all ecclesiastical government and ministerial authority as of divine appointment. She firmly holds, as an article of faith, to the doctrine of one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church, out of which there is no *ordinary* possibility of salvation; but her liberality is seen in making THIS, and not the presbyterian church, THE CHURCH; in making this catholic church coextensive with the elect children of God, that is with all, in every place, age, nation, or denomination, who are made partakers of the grace that is in Christ Jesus; in representing it as requiring, for the participation of all its privileges, only the belief of those essential principles, in knowledge of which standeth eternal life; and as embracing, in her visible form, all who even profess the true religion, together with their children. The presbyterian church believes also in the divine appointment of the christian ministry, and in its uninterrupted succession, from the apostles' time until now, and that ministers are the instruments by whom God works in the salvation of men; her liberality is seen in holding up these pastors, not as *legislators*, but only as *ministers* of Christ, and for his people; in not substituting them in the place of God as the sources of grace and

blessing; in subjecting them, as much as their people, to the Bible, as the common standard of faith; and in appealing to the conscience and private judgment of all her members. The presbyterian church believes in the necessity of government and order, and has confidence in the wisdom, utility, and scripturality of her own polity; her liberality is seen in not making these essential to the *being*, but only to the *well-being* of the church; in not claiming for any of its *details* exclusive divine authority or right; in assuming power to determine nothing more than those rules and orders of the church, which are in themselves either indifferent or necessary to the accomplishment of *required* duty, and which are undetermined in the word of God; in not enforcing these, as necessary in themselves considered, but as binding only upon those who can voluntarily and conscientiously receive them, and who can, therefore, unite with her; and in not excommunicating or unchurching other denominations, because they adopt different rules, forms, and orders.*

* That this is the view taken by the church of Scotland, appears from the following extract, taken from the speeches delivered on the commemoration of the assembly of 1638, p. 37. (See quoted and defended by Mr. Candlish, in his letter to the Dean of Faculty, Edinb. 1839.) 'I cannot enter fully on an argument like this, which would require to be discussed at great length. I may simply refer to the general principles which we hold to be established, by the authority and example of the apostles, as their practice may be gathered from the brief hints and notices given in the New Testament, regarding the churches which they formed. The system which they adopted, is not in any part of the inspired record fully unfolded — and perhaps it was not always uniform. But certain leading features may be traced throughout. Thus, the institution of deacons, charged with the care of the poor and the temporal concerns of the church, is placed beyond question, by the fact recorded in the sixth chapter of the Acts. Then, in addition to this office of a secular character, we find repeated mention made of another order of office-bearers in all the churches, called 'presbyters,' or 'elders,' as being men of grave authority; 'bishops,' or 'overseers,' as having the spiritual oversight of the flock, and described as having rule over the christian people, and watching for souls as those who must give account. And the only distinction which we can recognise in this last class, is between the elders or presbyters, who merely 'rule,' and those who, besides ruling, 'labor in word and doctrine,' (1 Tim. 1: 17,) a distinction

She regards the Catholic church as 'a great man's house, 'in which are many mansions,' which our heavenly Father has well furnished and prepared for all his children. She addresses, therefore, to all a common welcome, saying, come in ye blessed of the Father, and partake with us in all the blessings of His hospitable mansion, and His well-provisioned table. Ye who bear upon you the impress of a divine acceptance, who are clad in the spiritual vestments of a divine calling, who speak the language of heaven's adopted sons, however men may reject, scorn, or denounce you, come in, and let us, as brethren, dwell together in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace, as having one Lord, one faith, and one hope.

which seems to lay a foundation for the difference which we make between the ruling elder and the teaching elder or pastor, as holding separate offices, or rather separate branches of the same office. Beyond this simple order, we can discover nothing in Holy Scripture, regarding the early government of the christian society, excepting only the extraordinary powers exercised by the apostles themselves, and by evangelists specially commissioned by them, not as settled superintendents of particular dioceses, but as agents employed at large in forming and organizing new churches in all different parts of the world. But in this simple order, we have full warrant for the ordinance of a standing ministry, authorized by Christ himself, to rule his people, and to confer their own office on others, by solemn imposition of hands. We consider also that the New Testament gives evidence of a union between different churches and their office-bearers, and a control vested in councils of these office-bearers, over particular churches and their members. Thus we maintain, in the words of the illustrious McCrie, that the leading principles of presbytery rest on the authority of God, and that its subordinate arrangements are supported by the general rules of Scripture. They are simple, and well calculated to preserve order, and promote edification, equally opposed to arbitrary and lordly domination on the part of the clergy, and to popular confusion and misrule; establishing an efficient discipline in every congregation, and preserving that unity which ought to subsist among the different branches of the church of Christ.'—*Commemoration Speeches*, p. 37.

SECTION VII.

Testimonies in proof of the liberality of presbytery.

In substantiation of these views, deduced from the standards of the presbyterian church, we might add the testimony of eminent divines, of every period of its history, and in various branches of the presbyterian body. A few out of the many examples which are at hand, it may be well to present.

The Waldenses, in their Confession of 1508, after defining the Catholic church, say:* ‘But in regard to their own congregation, they thus conceive and teach, that that congregation, as other congregations, be they great or small, is not the holy universal church, but only a part and member thereof, as the Corinthians were, of whom the apostle speaks, 1 Corinthians, 12.’

As to the reformers, let Du Moulin speak for himself and them. ‘I know that under pretence, that the church of England hath another form of discipline than ours is — (our adversaries, the papists,) charge us that our religion is diverse. But experience confuteth this accusation.’ Indeed, so liberal were the views of our reformers, that many of those who were most devoted to the establishment of presbytery, are nevertheless, by an *ungenerous* perversion of their fraternal and kind expressions, in speaking of the English church, constantly held up as favorable to prelacy.†

* Blair’s Waldenses, vol. ii. p. 575.

† See these views fully presented in Lect. on Apost. Succ. Lect. iii. p. 63, Lect. xvi. and pp. 525, 526. Harmony of Confessions of the Ref. Ch. and the Preface, Lond. 1643. Blondel’s Declar. de la Sincerit. deseglises Ref. de France Sedan, 1619. Nubes Testium. pro moderato et pacifico de rebus theologicis et instituenda inter Protestantes concordia, by Joh. Alph. Turretine, Leipsic, 1720, 4to. Lond. Chr. Obs. Feb. 1839, p. 119. Edinb. Presb. Rev. April, 1839, p. 639. Schism by Dr. Hoppus, pp. 463, 485–491.

Knox showed his moderation by officiating to a congregation of episcopalian English exiles at Frankfort ; among whom a modified form of divine worship was agreed on — some things being taken from the liturgy of the church of England, others from the practice of Geneva.*

‘ We do, upon good reason,’ said Alexander Henderson, the rebuilder of the church of Scotland, in her second reformation, ‘ judge the church of England, in the midst of her ceremonies, to have been a true church ; and the ministry thereof, notwithstanding the many blemishes and corruptions cleaving unto it, to have been a true ministry ; and we shall never deny unto them that praise, whether in debating controversies with papists, or in practical divinity for private christians, which they do most justly deserve. Upon the other part, we are neither so ignorant, nor so arrogant, as to ascribe to the church of Scotland such absolute purity and perfection as hath not need, or cannot admit, of further reformation.’†

‘ When they troubled us but with ceremonies,’ adds Baillie, ‘ the world knows we went in with them as far as our duty to God or man could require ; but while they would have us, against standing laws, to receive arminianism and popery, and all they please, shall we not bear them witness to their opposition to the truth, though we should die for it, and preach the truth of God, wherein we have been brought up, against all who will gainsay ?’‡

‘ I never said nor thought,’ said the martyred Renwick, to bishop Paterson,§ ‘ that none could be saved except

* McCrie’s *Life of*, Period iv.

† *Life and Times*, by Dr. Aiton, p. 13. Dr. Muir’s *Disc. at Commemor. of the Genl. Ass. of 1638*, Glasg. 1838, p. 22. On the liberal conduct of the early Scottish church, see *Lectures on the Headship of Christ*, Glasg. 1840, pp. 80, 81. See her remarkable liberality in the case of archbishop Bancroft’s discourse and conduct. McCrie’s *Life of Melville*, vol. i. pp. 385 – 390. McCrie on the *Unity of the Church*, pp. 14, 15.

‡ *Ibid.*

§ *Hist. of the Covenanters*, vol. ii. p. 321.

they were of those principles ; but these are truths which I suffer for, and which I have not rashly concluded on, but deliberately, and of a long time have been confirmed, that they are sufficient points to suffer for.'

The Provincial council of London, in their work on the divine right of the Gospel Ministry, published in the year 1654, show the same spirit in their preface, to the reader. They here enumerate, among those with whom they desire union and harmony, 'the moderate, godly episcopal men, that hold ordination by presbyters to be lawful and valid ; that a bishop and a presbyter are one and the same order of ministry, that are orthodox in doctrinal truths, and yet hold that the government of the church by a perpetual moderator is most agreeable to scripture pattern. Though herein we differ from them, yet we are far from thinking that this difference should hinder a happy union between them and us. Nay, we crave leave to profess to the world, that it will never, (as we humbly conceive,) be well with England till there be a union endeavored and effected between those that are orthodox in doctrine, though differing among themselves in some circumstances about church government.'*

In the *Character of an Old English Puritan*, written by the Rev. John Gere, and published in 1646, it is said, 'right discipline he judged pertaining not to the being but to the well-being of the church. Therefore he esteemed those churches most pure, where the government is by elders, yet unchurched not those where it was otherwise.†

So also in '*A Model of Church Government*,' &c. 'by John Drury, one of the assembly of Divines,' it is said,

* Page 4. See also Pt. ii. pp. 20, 22, 23, (a defence of the character of the ministers of the English church,) 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 38. See also their *Div. Right of Ch. Govt.* pp. 120, 121, and *Firmin's Separation Examined*, addressed to them, p. 107. Also *Corbet's Remains*, p. 32, &c.

† London, p. 4.

'First, then, I think myself bound to declare this: that I am under a vow to prosecute, upon all occasions, as long as I live, the ways of evangelical reconciliation amongst PROTESTANTS; that is to say, professedly to seek, and upon all occasions offered to advance, amongst those that have received the holy scriptures for their rule, and keep to the fundamentals of faith and practice, the means of spiritual unity, of peace and of love, by the manifestation of the truth, and in the duties of holy communion. Having, therefore, this opportunity fairly offered, I am obliged, in minding my vow, to discharge a good conscience; and for the love which I owe unto the gospel of peace, to the whole church of God, and to the prosperity and flourishing condition thereof in this nation, to make some overtures, which I hope shall give no matter of grievance unto any, but will prove edifying unto all; at least my aim shall be none other, but to stir up thy pure mind, (christian reader,) to the thoughts of brotherly kindness, of meekness, and of peace, to the end that some ways may be taken up, which will help to reconcile the affections of many divided about circumstantialities; to preserve and keep entire the unity which remains about fundamentals; and to prevent or cure the manifold misprisions, which increase our confusions, and obstruct the remedies of our diseases.'*

We might refer to Baxter's works throughout. We will only extract one or two passages in his 'Disputations of Church Government,' written when the presbyterian party were in power.† In the preface he says, 'I know

* Lond. 1647, 4to. Preface. The assembly of Divines split on the subject of toleration, many members advocating liberal views. See Wilson's *Historical Inquiry concerning the English Presbyterians*, pp. 3, 4, 5, 20, 23. That they were willing to accommodate with the Episcopalians, see *ibid*, p. 144, 147, 153, 171. See also their noble liberality, when they could have retaliated, in Neal's *Puritans*, vol. v. pp. 16, 17, 23, and vol. iv. pp. 391, 418, and vol. v. pp. 33, 36, 37, 41, 58.

† Lond. 1659. Pref. p. 19. See also Neal, vol. iv. pp. 226 and 231, for similar sentiments under similar circumstances.

also that the casting out of the ministers of your way, is much that offendeth you: concerning which I shall only say, that I meet with none, or very few, that profess not their willingness that all men of your mind, that truly fear God, and are able and diligent, should be kept in. And if you be angry for the casting out of the ignorant, insufficient, negligent or scandalous, there is no remedy. But be ashamed to reproach us for casting out such from the service of Christ, as Julian the apostate would have cast out from the priesthood of his idols: and let us crave your leave to expect as much devotion in the servants of Christ, as he expected in his enemies.'

Still more remarkable are the following words from his own Life.* 'My censures of the papists do much differ from what they were at first. I then thought that their errors in the doctrines of faith were their most dangerous mistakes. But now I am assured that their mis-expressions and misunderstanding us, with our mistakings of them and inconvenient expressing of own opinions, have made the difference in most points appear much greater than it is; and that in some it is next to none at all. But the great and unreconcilable differences lie in their church tyranny; in the usurpations of their hierarchy, and priesthood, under the name of spiritual authority, exercising a temporal lordship; in their corruptions and abasement of God's worship; but, above all, in their systematic befriending of ignorance and vice.'

'At first I thought that Mr. Perkins well proved that a papist cannot go beyond a reprobate; but now I doubt not that God hath many sanctified ones among them; who have received the true doctrine of christianity so practically, that their contradictory errors prevail not against them, to hinder their love of God, and their salvation: but that their errors are like a conquerable dose

* Part i. p. 131.

of poison, which a healthful nature doth overcome. *And I can never believe that a man may not be saved by that religion, which doth but bring him to the true love of God and to a heavenly mind and life ; nor that God will ever cast a soul into hell that truly loveth him.* Also at first it would disgrace any doctrine with me, if I did but hear it called popery and antichristian ; but I have long learned to be more impartial, and to know that Satan can use even the names of popery and antichrist, to bring a truth into suspicion and discredit.’

To this might be added the testimony of one who suffered from the tyranny of prelates as much as any other. We refer to Bastwick, in his ‘ Utter Routing,’ &c. ; but as the passage is long, we can only refer to it.*

‘ I do likewise abhor,’ says Mathew Henry, ‘ all schismatical, that is, uncharitable, proud, censorious, rigid separation, such separation as theirs who condemn the parish churches as no parts of the visible church, who rail at ministers as babylonish and antichristian ; this is a horrid breach of the law of christian love, and that which every good heart cannot but rise at the thoughts of.’†

How many pages might we fill from the sainted Howe.‡ In his deepest sufferings at the hands of the prelates, he declares that one of his chief consolations in suffering was, the ‘ consciousness that he had no other than kind or benign thoughts towards those whom he has suffered by ; and that his heart tells him he desires not the least hurt to those that would do him the greatest ; that he feels within himself an unfeigned love and high estimation of divers of them, accounting them pious, worthy persons,

* The title of this really learned defence of presbyterianism, is one of the most remarkable among the many that are so. It is a 4to. of pp. 662. Lond. 1646. See at pp. 567 – 570.

† Brief Inq. into the Nature of Schism, Lond. 1717, p. 24. See also his Wks. p. 1137, col. 1.

‡ See his Life, by Rodgers, p. 323. Lond. 1836. See also at pp. 288, 312, 333, 358, 366.

and hoping to meet them in the *all-reconciling* world.' The *all-reconciling* world! How beautiful is that expression!

'We do sincerely profess,' he adds, 'wherein we decline the communion he invites us to; we only displease him and those of his way and mind, out of a real fear of otherwise displeasing God. We agree with them in far greater things than we can differ in. We are of that one body which they themselves profess to be of, so far as mere christianity is the distinction and collective bond of it, and desire to be under the conduct and government of that one spirit. We are called with them in that one hope of our calling, and earnestly expect, (whatever hard thoughts they have of us,) to meet many a one of them in the participation of the blessed hoped end of that calling. We acknowledge that one Lord, that one faith, that one baptism, (or covenant which the baptism of our Lord's appointment seals,) and that one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all. Yet because we cannot, we dare not consent with them to the additions which belong not (and which we fear are unduly affixed) to the religion of christianity.'

Such also were the liberal sentiments of the opponents of prelacy in New England. Thus Mr. Welles, in his *Vindication of Presbyterian Ordination*, in answer to Mr. Leaming, says, 'We, on the other hand, from the same testimonies, believe infant baptism, and the first day sabbath. We accordingly practice them. But then, 'we have not so learned Christ,' as to think it our duty, either by our principles or practice, to unchurch and unchristianize all who differ from us in these points: but, if they are otherwise qualified, cheerfully admit their ministers into our pulpits, and their members to communion, in gospel ordinances.*

* New Haven, 1767, pp. 5, 19.

Dr. Chandler, in his plea for the establishment of an American episcopate, and against which there existed such irresistible prejudices, thus speaks of 'the dissenters.'* 'Whatever notions the dissenters in this country may have formerly entertained concerning the church, yet of late years they have greatly come off from their prejudices; and sentiments of candor, charity, and moderation have visibly taken place. And as to dissenters of other denominations, the subject has been proposed to some of the most sensible of them, who have, with great candor, confessed, that as such an episcopate as has been requested could have no ill effect upon any, they had no objections to offer. Nay, some have even been so generous, as to endeavor to undeceive their more ignorant and illiberal brethren, if the author of these papers has not been misinformed.'

As it regards the present views and sentiments of the presbyterian church in this country, in Scotland, and in Ireland, it is unnecessary to produce any testimonies beyond what have been offered.† The following remarks, by Dr. Candlish, will at once, however, serve as evidence of the truth of our position, and an illustration of the true grounds upon which our liberality is based.‡ After expressing his profound respect for the church of England, he says, 'And in entire consistency with these more than friendly sentiments, I hold the divine right of presbytery, and I believe that the system of episcopacy is unscriptural, while the line of argument by which it is defended seems to me to lead naturally to the establish-

* App. for the Ch. of Eng. in Am. p. 88, and again, pp. 90 and 93.

† As it regards this country, see Dr. Rodgers's Life, p. 328. Dr. Rice, as quoted. Dr. Miller on the Min. 2d ed. 8vo. p. viii. x. xlviii. pp. 219, 231, 247-258. Dr. Mason's Catholic Commun. and Works, vol. iii. pp. 30, 31. As it regards President Davies, see Bib. Repert. 1840, pp. 190, 191, 201, 204. Dr. McLeod's Eccl. Catech. p. 115. Bib. Repert. 1836, p. 34.

‡ Remarks on the Dean of Faculty's Letter, Edinb. 1839, pp. 16, 17.

ment of the authority of a pope. I am aware, that some of those who have avowed their conviction, that 'the presbyterian form is founded on the word of God, and agreeable thereto,' understand this as meaning nothing more, than that the word of God is as much in favor of presbyterianism as of any other model—perhaps, on the whole, rather more so. They consider that the Scripture says nothing very definite on the subject, and furnishes no means of ascertaining very positively, what kind of government the Great Head of the church intended to institute. They say, therefore, of presbytery, as they would almost equally say of episcopacy, or of independency, that 'it is founded on the word of God, and agreeable thereto,' because they think that the word of God affords room for very considerable latitude, and that the hints and directions which it contains, are so general as to admit of several different schemes being viewed as almost equally in accordance with the divine will. I do not quarrel with this explanation of our ordination formula, in those who conscientiously adopt it. But for myself, I take it somewhat more strictly. According to my view of it, it implies, that the word of God has laid a foundation for a certain form of government in the church, and that presbytery is exclusively that form. I believe that the New Testament does contain sufficient elements for a determination of the question,—what is the mind of God in this matter? that it was not the design of our Lord and his apostles to leave it altogether loose: that there is enough to guide one who can use his reason in interpreting Scripture, to a knowledge of what they meant to establish and to sanction. Entertaining these opinions, I cannot regard the distinction between different forms of church government as one of little importance. I love the church of England, but I condemn her episcopacy.'

'Let me try to enlighten the Dean of Faculty on this

dark mystery of toleration. It is quite true, that the introduction of the element of divine authority, in support of any religious truth, or any ecclesiastical arrangement, necessarily involves uncompromising hostility to whatever is opposed to it. But there are two antagonist principles which prevent that hostility from becoming intolerance. The one is the principle which leads enlightened christians to make a distinction between the merits of an opinion or system, and those of the individuals who hold it. The other lies in the distinction made between truths held to be essential, and those admitted to be of less vital importance. The first principle allows us to recognise as christians, many individual members of a church, which we denounce as itself antichristian. The second admits of our recognising churches as christian, even although in some features of their constitution, we regard them as anti-scriptural. These principles of toleration and liberality, which are distinct from the general obligation of christian charity, towards the persons of such as differ from us, and which are directly opposed to the spurious latitudinarian charity of indulgence towards their errors, maintain, amid all its schisms, the unity of the body of Christ. According to the first principle, protestants, who hold the church of Rome to be Babylon, may cherish the hope that not a few in its communion are their brethren in Christ; and Puseyites, who hold the church of Scotland to be no church at all, and who call her Samaria, may admit that some presbyterians may be saved. According to the second principle, we who view episcopacy as an anti-scriptural error, yet satisfied that it may not be an error in essentials, cordially embrace the church of England, as a true church of the living God, having a sound faith, and a scriptural administration of sacraments.

‘I have not time to illustrate these principles. But I think that they deserve the consideration of those who may be carried away by the outcry about intolerance, and

especially by the elaborate parallel drawn, between the views held by some of us, in regard to the divine authority of the presbyterial form of government, and the doctrines of the Oxford divines in regard to apostolical succession. It should have been known, that there is the widest difference of opinion between us and them, as to the real nature and essential conditions of a christian church, and that this difference makes the attempt to confound our sentiments altogether unreasonable and unfair. It is not their appeal to scriptural authority on behalf of their doctrine, but it is the doctrine itself, which compels them to exclude from the pale of the christian church all presbyterian communities.*

Never was a more glorious testimony borne to the advancing spirit of true catholic liberality, than by the general assembly of the church of Scotland in 1842, in cancelling the schismatical act of 1799, whereby she recognises the church as one body, though called by many names, and scattered over many regions of the earth, and opens her pulpits to ministers of other denominations; in receiving deputations from England, Ireland, America, Prussia, and Switzerland; in opening up correspondence with all those churches who hold the Head; in memorializing all christians to unite in a concert of prayer; and in taking measures for the union of all evangelical denominations in some fraternal league.†

If, then, we would say in conclusion, to every member of the presbyterian church,‡ if any man ask you what

* See similar views in Dr. Chalmers's *Lect. on Establishments*, 8vo. Eng. ed. pp. 180–185, and *Letter to the Dean of Faculty*, p. 101. Anderson's *Def. of Presb.* pp. 347, &c. and 379. Edward Irving's *Sermons*, vol. ii. p. 234. Mitchell's *Letters to Bishop Skinner*, pp. 7, 85. *Manual of Presbytery*, by Mr. Lorimer, Edinb. 1842, p. 165.

† See the *Presb. Rev.* Edinb. July, 1842, and *Proceed. of General Assembly*, p. 4, &c. Also the *Plan for Observing the Bi-Centenary of the Westminster Assembly*, by the Commission, on Nov. 16th, 1842.

‡ See Baxter's *Works*, vol. xvi. pp. 327, 328. *Disput. on Ch. Govt.* pp. 240–252.

church you are of, tell him, that you are of that particular church where you dwell ; but for the catholic church you know but one, and that you are of. Thrust not yourselves into a corner of the church, and there stand quarrelling against the rest ; make not sectaries of yourselves by appropriating Christ, and the church, and salvation, to your party ; abhor the very thoughts and name of any universal church of Christ, which is of narrower extent than christianity, and containeth fewer than all true christians, and is pretended to be confined to a sect. It is not the papists that are the catholic church, nor is it the Greeks, no, nor the protestants, much less the new prelates alone ; but it is all christians through the world, of whom the protestants are the soundest part, but not the whole. Again, consider what a lamentable case it is, that so great a part of the church do seem to be at a loss about the church, as if they knew not where it is. That they run up and down the house of God, complaining that they cannot find the house, and know not which room it is that is the house. But in the house of God are many rooms and mansions ; one for Greeks, and one for Ethiopians, one for Armenians, and Georgians, and Syrians ; one for many that are called papists ; one for Lutherans and Arminians ; one for Anabaptists, and one for many that are truly guilty of schism and separation from particular churches ; there is room for Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, and Erastians ; there is room for Augustinians, called Jansenists, and room for Calvinists ; but yet no room for any but christians and catholics. Alas, that after so many warnings in plainest words of Scripture, and the history of so many ages, so many christians should yet be so carnal, as to be saying, I am of Paul, and I am of Apollos, and I of Cephas, that is, Peter ; yea, that after Cephas is here named as a party, the papists should be so wilfully blind as still to make him the head of a party ! That one is for Rome, and

another for Constantinople, and another for Alexandria ! When that Augustine hath so long ago decided this point against the Donatists, and told them which is the catholic church, even that which begun at Jerusalem, and is extended over the world, wherever there be christians. Alas, that still men are so stupid in their divisions, as to be crying out, ' here is Christ, and there is Christ ; here is the church, and there is the church ; we are the church, and you are none of it ; ' when the body of Christ and its unity is so frequently and plainly described in the Scripture. I know that none are members of the church that deny any essential point of christianity ; but I know that many other mistaken parties are. Consider what an uncharitable, dangerous thing it is to give Christ's spouse a bill of divorce ; or cast his children out of his family. And in the name of God take heed whilst you live, first, that you never confine the church to a sect or party ; secondly, nor ever cast out the least true christians, seeing Christ will never cast them out.'

SECTION VIII.

The illiberal character of Romish and Anglican prelacy.

But to all this, how contrary is the spirit of prelacy. The intolerance which is *necessarily* connected with the prelatie or high-church system, we have already demonstrated from their own recent and standard works, and from their own practical exemplifications of its principles.* The whole system is essentially bigoted and illiberal in every thing that respects *mere external forms*, while latitudinarian in all that relates to the *essential doc-*

* See Lect. on the Apost. Succ. pp. 171, 318, 319, 324, 325, 326, 342, 344, 469, 470.

trines of the gospel. Prelacy shows its claim to liberality and comprehensiveness, by 'receiving within its pale all varieties of opinions,' and teaching, that 'agreement of opinion, even in some of THE CARDINAL DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY, is not essential to harmony of feeling, to christian fellowship, and general union.'* Thus does it prove, that in its view conformity and external union is of more importance than christianity itself, and that obedience is the sum and substance of the gospel. Changing the being of religion into superstition, and becoming more and more earthly and servile, it is in a fair way to realize the picture drawn by Coleridge:† 'as more and more estranged from the one in all, it goes wandering at length with its pack of amulets, bead-rolls, periapts, fetishes, and the like pedlery, on pilgrimages to Loretto, Mecca, or the temple of Juggernaut, arm in arm with sensuality on one side, and self-torture on the other, followed by a motley group of friars, pardoners, faquirs, gamesters, flagellants, mountebanks, and harlots.' 'Thus, under the mask of indifference,' says Lord Brooke, 'prelacy hath brought in most abominable superstitions, and most intolerable slavery on the persons, liberties, bodies and souls of men. For they have pressed consciences, even unto gasping; yea, and would not be satisfied, though they daily heard the sighs and groans of those bleeding hearts, which themselves had stabbed with the poisoned sword of Church-Indifference.'‡

Prelatists are now mad after their plan of 'catholic reunion' among the divided portions of Christ's church. And what is this plan? Let one of themselves answer.§ This plan, 'which forms the secret mainspring of the

* Oxf. Tracts, vol. i. p. 428. Colton's Reasons for Preferring Episcopacy, p. 45, &c.

† Church and State, &c. Lond. 1839, p. 261.

‡ Disc. of Episcopacy, Lond. 1642, p. 60.

§ The Churchman's Monthly Review, Jan. 1842, p. 12.

Tractarian School, is based on two fundamental maxims, which (as *lucus a non lucendo*) they are pleased to term 'catholic principles.' The first is, the absolute necessity to the very being of a church, of a threefold order in a visible priesthood, derived by an unbroken episcopal succession from the apostles. The second is, the duty of entirely renouncing the exercise of private judgment, and of submitting, with implicit deference, to the decrees of general councils. In these two maxims, which practically replace, in their system, the two tables of the law, they place the very essence of the christian church. The church of Rome, therefore, the Eastern or Greek, the Anglican and the Anglo-American, are true churches, have the entail of the covenant, and their reunion is to be sought by all practicable means. All other communions are not churches, but 'protestant persuasions,' groups of heretics or schismatics, having no ecclesiastical character, and which are left to the uncovenanted mercies of God. Their members, indeed, may, on confession, be received into the church by the sacrament of penance; but the communities themselves are, *de facto*, excommunicated. To seek direct intercourse with them, would, therefore, involve the forfeiture of our own catholicity, would degrade us to their level, and would thus betray that awful privilege of 'making the body and blood of Christ,' which is committed to our own priesthood, in common with the Greek and Romish priests, and to these alone.'

'Such is the 'catholic' theory of reunion, which Mr. Hope with calmness, and Mr. Palmer with bitterness and passion, press upon their readers.' Well may the reviewer, an episcopalian of the liberal school, add, 'we know not how to express our sense of the enormous falsehood it involves, or of the awful peril of that course which is thus recommended for our adoption at the present time. First of all, the full testimony of Scripture

to the true nature and essential elements of the christian church, is cast away, trodden under foot, and despised. In its room there is put forward a human definition, without one shadow of warrant from God's word; a definition fraught with all the worst elements of spiritual blindness, heartless bigotry, and priestly ambition. We ask for the bread of sound doctrine, and they give us the stone of lifeless forms; we seek for the sustenance of spiritual worship, and they offer us the serpent-sophistries, which palliate and excuse the gross idolatry of Rome. Next, that search for truth which made the Bereans noble in God's sight, that choice which Moses, Joshua, and St. Paul, with one voice enjoin and command, is openly proscribed as the very essence of heresy, in defiance of the clearest declarations of the Spirit of God. The laity, bound hand and foot, are given over as helpless slaves to the guidance of the priesthood, and these again, in the same blind subjection, to their superiors; till, by degrees, all the tightening links of unity gather around the seven-hilled seat of the Babylonian harlot, and the visible church, that noble ordinance for the salvation and spiritual life of ransomed sinners, is turned into one vast engine of spiritual delusion, by which the adversary may lead millions of souls blindfold to their eternal ruin.'

Surely

If there be rule in unity itself,
This is not she.*

As it regards popery, 'it must be acknowledged,' says M. Villers, himself a Romanist, 'that the spirit of papism is exclusive and intolerant.'† Now the spirit of an insti-

* Shakspeare's *Troilus and Cressida*.

† Essay on the Spirit and Influence of the Reformation, the work which obtained the prize of the National Institute of France. London, 1805, pp. 79, and 99, 100, *et passim*.

tution cannot cease to act, unless the institution cease also.*

That this testimony is true, and that even the free air of this republican country cannot infuse a liberal spirit into a system, which 'owes its establishment and continuance only to the fertility and perpetuity of error,' and which lives, therefore, upon its intolerant exclusiveness and its spiritual despotism, will appear from the following facts. We will first present an extract from 'A Collection of Prayers, Spiritual Exercises, &c., interspersed with the various instructions necessary for forming youth to the practice of solid piety. Originally arranged for the young ladies educated at the Ursuline Convent, Cork. Revised by the Very Rev. John Power, and approved by the Right Rev. Bishop Hughes, pp. 518. New York, 1839.'

Whenever a protestant minister raises his voice, to warn his flock against the insidious efforts of the adherents of the pope, to bring our beloved country under the spiritual tyranny of a foreign potentate, the cry of uncharitableness and persecution is raised, not only by papists, but by many nominal protestants. To give our readers a little specimen of the *charity* of holy mother church, towards all who doubt her infallibility, and renounce her communion, we present the following extracts from a dissertation at the end of the volume, on the reasons for adhering to the Roman catholic religion.

* 'It is true, that popery is advancing. It is true that popery, assuming as it does for the church a divine right to judge for the people what is truth, is, and *must* be, intolerant. It is true, that its history is written in blood, and that no denials, no arguments, or even sophistry, can wipe from its published and current documents, its broad and glaring sanction of whatever oppression, even unto cruel death, may be deemed needful to exterminate *whatsoever* is not submissive to itself. It is true, that, (whatever bright examples of ardent piety, of tender charity, and generous equity, may have been, or may be, found in its communion,) all that is terrible to rational liberty may be feared, if it should be armed with power, giving scope to its persecuting and inexorable *spirit*. That popery is advancing is no light thing — believe and tremble!' *The Cry of No Popery*. Lond. 1842.

‘ But is it not very uncharitable, to believe that the Roman catholic church, besides being the only true church, is the only one in which salvation can be obtained ? ’

‘ It is by no means uncharitable to believe this ; no more than it is uncharitable to believe any awful truth which God has revealed.’

‘ But, at least, is it not very uncharitable, in Roman catholics, to abjure all manner of communication, in religious exercises, with those of every other religion ? ’

‘ This abjuration, or refusal, so far from being uncharitable, is, in their mind, enforced by the truest charity. Convinced, as Roman catholics are, and firmly persuaded, that there is, and that there can be, no other true religion than their own, they cannot, consistently, nor candidly, nor lawfully, approve, or even appear to approve, any other religion ; which they certainly should appear to do, were they thus to join in these religious exercises, or frequent places of worship belonging to separated communions. Such temporizing conduct has the aspect of prevarication ; it is, in short, betraying the truth of God. In their principles they must abhor it, as calculated to delude their separated brethren into an unfounded, and therefore into a most dangerous, security. Charity here compels them to stand off. Besides, esteeming the gift of divine faith to be invaluable, inasmuch as, without faith, it is impossible to please God, they cannot innocently expose themselves to the danger of losing it.’

‘ But still, when those of other religions scruple not occasionally to attend at Roman catholic sermons, and at religious exercises in Roman catholic places of worship, would there not be something more brotherly in returning this compliment, than in standing off with such rigor ! ’

‘ The preceding answer has anticipated a negative to this question ; it is now, in addition, to be observed, that the principles of other religions allow of such communi-

cation; the principles of the Roman catholic religion peremptorily forbid it.'

It is truly overwhelming to consider the wantonness with which the salvation of the soul is made to depend upon the belief of points, either notoriously untrue, or incapable of any establishment. Thus we are required to believe in the uninterrupted succession and duration of the Romish church.* And yet we know that this is not true as to location, since the popes, with their court, resided at Avignon, for seventy years together;† nor as to persons, since many of the popes were heretics, or infidels, and therefore no true popes; and since it is beyond the power of any human being to decide who, in many cases, were popes, and who were not; or whether there was any at all. It is equally untrue as to order, either in worship or discipline, which have been both changed and altered; while, as to doctrine, that church is found insisting upon articles of faith, *now*, which the early Roman church, and all the other primitive churches, knew nothing of.

We must also believe that the church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all churches, or otherwise be accursed;‡ and yet truth obliges us to reject this claim, and to grant it to the mother church at Jerusalem. We must further believe that the apocryphal books are canonical, or be accursed;§ and yet are we required, by all evidence, external and internal, by St. Jerome, and by pope Gregory I, to believe that this assertion is most glaringly unfounded.||

Now surely this is a very awful position, in which an infallible church should place her members. Believe her, and they must be condemned by God, for believing a lie! Believe the truth, and they must endure the anathematizing curse of this infallible church! Believe all that

* This is Bellarmine's Third Note, lib. iv. c. 4.

† Bellam. de Pontif. lib. iv. c. 4.

‡ Concil. Trid. Sen. 7, de Bapt. Can. 3, et Bulla Pii. iv.

§ Concil. Trid. Sen. 4.

|| See bishop Williamson, in Notes of the Ch. p. 102, &c.

was made essential to salvation, by any orthodox church, for hundreds of years, and yet reject the superadded dogmas of this upstart church of Rome, and you are forthwith abandoned to all the terrors of her abiding curse !

The entire creed of pope Pius, to which every Romanist adheres, is an anathema and a curse upon all other denominations of christians. 'I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the church.'* The church of Rome, on pain of anathema, teaches to be essential to salvation, and requires as a condition of communion, an assent to the following propositions : †

1. That they are accursed, who do not honor, salute, and honorably worship, the holy and venerable images. Deutero. Nicene. See pp. 109–111. Creed of Pius IV, p. 48.

2. That they are accursed, who do not believe that Christ is present in the holy eucharist, by way of transubstantiation ; or who affirm, that, after consecration, the substance of the bread and wine remain in the consecrated elements. Lateran IV, pp. 132, 133. Trent, pp. 238, 239. Creed of Pius IV, p. 48.

3 That they are accursed, who do not believe that there is a purgatory. Florence, pp. 152, 153. Trent, p. 333. Creed of Pius IV, p. 48.

4. That they are accursed, who do not receive, for sacred and canonical, the books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, two of Maccabees, and the additions to the book of Daniel, to wit, the Story of Susannah, the Song of the Three Children, and the history of Bel and the Dragon. Trent, p. 161. Creed of Pius IV, p. 49.

* See given in full in Cramp's Text Book of Popery, pp. 388, 389.

† See Perceval's Roman Schism, pp. 25–27,

5. That they are accursed, who deny that confirmation, repentance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony, are truly and properly sacraments. Trent, p. 213. Creed of Pius IV, p. 47.

6. That they are accursed, who shall say that there is not required in the ministers, while they perform and confer the sacraments, at least the intention of doing what the church does. Trent, p. 217.

7. That they are accursed, who deny that the church of Rome is the mother and mistress of all churches. Creed of Pius IV, p. 48.

8. That they are accursed, who refuse obedience to the bishop of Rome. Creed of Pius IV, p. 48.

9. That they are accursed, who shall deny that whole and entire Christ, body and blood, soul and divinity, is contained at the same time in every species of bread in the eucharist, and in every particle thereof; and in every species of wine in the eucharist, and in every particle thereof. Trent, pp. 230, 240.

10. That they are accursed, who shall deny that Christ, in the eucharist, ought to be carried about and exhibited to the people. Trent, p. 241.

11. That they are accursed, who shall deny that sacramental confession to the priests, of every sin, was ordained by Christ, and is, by divine authority, necessary for forgiveness. Trent, p. 281.

12. That they are accursed, who shall affirm that the sacramental absolution of the priest is a ministerial and not a judicial act. Trent, p. 283.

13. That they are accursed, who shall say that the anointing of the sick does not confer grace. Trent, p. 288.

14. That they are accursed, who shall say, that by the command of God, all and each of Christ's faithful people ought to receive both species of the most holy sacrament of the eucharist. Trent, p. 296.

15. That they are accursed, who shall say that the

masses, in which the priest alone receives sacramental communion, are unlawful. Trent, p. 311.

16. That they are accursed, who shall say that the church has not power to dispense with the Levitical degrees of consanguinity as impediments to marriage. Trent, p. 327.

17. That they are accursed, who shall deny that marriage, solemnized but not consummated, is dissolved by the religious profession of one of the parties. Trent, p. 328.

18. That they are accursed, who shall say, that the clergy may contract marriages. Lateran I, p. 125. Lateran II, p. 126, 127. Trent, p. 329.

19. That they are accursed, who shall deny that the saints departed are to be invoked. Trent, p. 353. Creed of Pius IV, p. 48.

20. That they are accursed, who shall deny the utility of indulgences. Trent, p. 339. Creed of Pius IV, p. 48.

Clement VI, in his bull of anathema, issued against the emperor Louis of Bavaria, expresses himself thus: * 'May God strike him with imbecility and madness; may heaven overwhelm him with its thunders; may the anger of God, with that of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, fall upon him in this world and in the next; may the whole universe revolt against him; may the earth swallow him up alive; may his name perish from the earliest generation, and may his memory disappear; may all the elements be adverse to him; may his children, delivered into the hands of his enemies, be crushed before the eyes of their father,' &c. Such language, adds M. Villers, did not prevent *Petrarch*, playing on the name of this pope, from saying, that he was *clemency itself*; while *Garasse*, and all his worthy successors, delight in repeating, that *Luther* was a *clownish monk*, a *hot-headed heresiarch*, and other pitiful things. Strange blindness of ignorance and fanaticism!

* Rainaldi Ann. Eccles. in Villers on the Ref. p. 257.

The bull against Henry VIII, is 'the excommunication and damnation of Henry.' That against Elizabeth is 'the excommunication and damnation of the queen.' In like manner does this church damn all infants that have not been baptized by her. 'Whither,' she asks, 'go infants, that die without baptism? Answer. *To that part of hell where they suffer the pains of loss, but not the punishment of sense*; and shall never see the face of God.'

The following also is a copy of an excommunication, found among the papers of Philip Dunn, a Roman catholic bishop, who resided in the county of Wicklow. 'By the authority of God the Father Almighty, and the blessed Virgin Mary, of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of all the holy saints, we excommunicate Francis Freeman, late of the city of Dublin, but now of Sackmill, in the county of Wicklow; that in spite of God and St. Peter, in spite of all the holy saints, and in spite of our holy father the pope, God's vicar here on earth, and in spite of our right reverend father in God, Philip Dunn, our diocesan, and the worshipful canons, &c., who serve God daily, he hath apostatized to a *most damnable religion, full of heresy and blasphemy.*' (*Let protestants hear it!*) 'Excommunicated let him be, and delivered over to the devil, as a perpetual malefactor and schismatic. Accursed let him be, and given over, *body and soul*, to the devil. Cursed let him be in all cities, and in all towns, in fields, in ways, in yards, in houses, and in all other places, whether lying or rising, walking or running, leaning or standing, waking or sleeping, eating or drinking, or in whatsoever thing he does besides. We separate him from the threshold, and all good prayers of the church, from the participation of the holy Jesus, from all sacraments, chapels, and altars, from holy bread and holy water, from all the merits of God's holy priests, and all holy men, and from all cloisters, from all pardons, privileges, grants, and immunities, which all the holy fathers, the popes, have granted to

them; and we give him over to the power of the fiend; and let him quench his soul, when dead, in the flames of hell fire, as the candle is now quenched and put out; and let us pray to God, our lady, St. Peter, and St. Paul, that all the senses of his body may fail, as now the light of his candle is gone out; except he comes, on sight hereof, and openly confesses his damnable heresy and blasphemy, and by repentance, as much as in him lies, make satisfaction to God, our lady, St. Peter, and St. Paul, the worshipful company of this church. And as the staff of this holy cross now falls down, so may he, unless he recants and repents.

‘PHILIP DUNN,

‘BRYAN MOORE, *Register*.’

‘We must be further allowed to remind you,’ says the able address of the American Protestant Association, ‘that notwithstanding the modest guise which that church puts on, in this and other protestant countries, no evidence whatever has been produced, emanating *from the Papal See*, that it has abated its pretensions, or laid aside its persecuting tenets. We are not satisfied with the disclaimers of Roman Catholic laymen or the denials of Romish priests. We insist upon a renunciation from the only authority in the church, which has the right to make one. We demand that the same power which enjoined the persecutions of former days, shall express its disapproval of them, and repudiate the pretended right to persecute for opinion’s sake. When proof of this sort is produced, we may listen to the suggestion that popery has put off its intolerance. We do not, however, rest here. We have a witness at hand, who will be deemed both competent and credible as to the point under consideration. This witness is Gregory XVI, the reigning pope; and the document from which we quote, is his famous Encyclical Letter of August 15th, 1832.

‘From that polluted fountain of indifference, flows that absurd and erroneous doctrine, or rather raving, in favor

and in defence of '*liberty of conscience*,' for which *most pestilential error*, the course is opened by that entire and wild *liberty of opinion* which is every where attempting the overthrow of civil and religious institutions; and which the unblushing impudence of some, has held forth as an advantage of religion. * * * * From hence arise these revolutions in the minds of men; hence, this aggravated corruption of youth; hence, this contempt among the people of sacred things, and of the most holy institutions and laws; hence, in one word, *that pest of all others most to be dreaded in a state, unbridled liberty of opinion.*'

Again. 'Hither tends that worst and *never sufficiently to be execrated and detested liberty of the press*, for the diffusion of all manner of writings, which some so loudly contend for, and so actively promote.'

And again. 'Nor can we augur more consoling consequences to religion and to government, from the zeal of some to separate *the church from the state*, and to burst the bond which unites the priesthood to the empire. For it is clear that this union is dreaded by the profane lovers of liberty, only because it has never failed to confer prosperity on both.'

To this testimony, we append the following extracts from the theology of Peter Dens, a book which is used in the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth, Ireland. An edition of this work has been published at Mechlin, in the Netherlands, as recently as the year 1838. It is there distinctly asserted, that

'Baptized infidels, such as heretics and apostates usually are, also baptized schismatics, may *be compelled, even by corporal punishments*, to return to the Catholic faith, and the unity of the church.'

'The reason is, because these by baptism have become subject to the church, and therefore the church has juris-

diction over them, and the power of compelling them, through appointed means of obedience, to fulfil the obligations contracted in baptism.'

Again, it is said, by the same author :

'The rites of other infidels, namely, pagans and heretics, in themselves considered, are not to be *tolerated*; because they are so bad that no truth or advantage for the good of the church can be thence derived. Except, however, unless greater evils would follow, or greater benefits be hindered.'

After stating that heretics are deservedly visited with penalties of exile, imprisonment, and so forth, this author asks :

'Are heretics *rightly punished with death* ?'

'St. Thomas' answers, (2. 2. quest. XI, art. 3, in corp.)

Yes, because forgers of money or other disturbers of the state, are justly punished with death ; therefore also heretics, who are forgers of the faith, and, as experience shows, grievously disturb the state.'

'Here is documentary evidence of the highest kind, to show that popery is *unchanged*; to prove that the popery of the 19th century and the popery of the 16th are the same. We have it affirmed by a standard authority in the Romish church, that it is *right to put heretics to death*. And we have it officially promulgated by the *present pope*, that LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE, LIBERTY OF OPINION, the LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, and the SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, are four of the sorest evils with which a nation can be cursed ! Both as protestants and as American citizens, we count the rights which are here assailed as among our dearest franchises ; and we cannot look on in silence and see the craft and power of Rome systematically and insidiously employed to subvert them. We deplore the necessity which calls for the measure ; but, believing as we do, that patriotism and christianity

demand it, we have united, and we invite all who love our institutions to unite with us in repelling the aggressions of the papal hierarchy.'

We may, therefore, apply to this doctrine of prelacy, both Romish and Anglican, the words of Shakspeare :

'Nay, had it power, it would
Pour the sweet milk of concord into hell,
Uproar the universal peace, confound
All unity on earth.'

It is, then, no part of liberality to call this system of prelacy, whether Romish or Anglican, catholic. It should be remembered, to use the words of Coleridge, that the Romish anti-catholic church, would more truly express the fact. *Romish*, to mark that the corruptions in discipline, doctrine, and practice do, for the larger part, owe both their origin and perpetuation to the Romish court, and the local tribunals of the city of Rome; and neither are or ever have been catholic, that is, universal, throughout the Roman empire, or even in the whole Latin or Western church; and *anti-catholic*, because no other church acts on so narrow and excommunicative a principle, or is characterized by such a jealous spirit of monopoly. Instead of a catholic (universal) spirit, it may be truly described as a spirit of particularism, counterfeiting catholicity by a negative totality and heretical self-circumspection; in the first instances cutting off, and since then cutting herself off, from all the other members of Christ's body.*

We are well aware, that in expressing these sentiments, we will be held up as utterly contradicting our own principles of liberality, and as being bigots of the fiercest order. Now it has been justly remarked,† that persecution for conscience sake, is so odious, and the

* Aids to Reflection, Lond. 1839, pp. 155, 156.

† See Life of Knox, vol. i. pp. 301, 303.

least approach to it so dangerous, that we deem it impossible to express too great detestation of any measure, which tends to countenance, or seems to encourage it. 'But let us be just as well as liberal.' We speak the truth in Christ, and lie not. We are exceedingly pressed in spirit, and constrained to give our public testimony against the system of European popery. We are sincerely sacrificing our own personal feeling in so doing. Most heartily do we wish we could remain silent, or think otherwise of this dangerous foreign and hostile system. But it is impossible. Woe is unto us if we speak not out, and give a timely warning.

Let that warning be heard. Let our views be candidly examined. Let us, as protestants and presbyterians, have the same freedom of speech, and the same candid and impartial hearing, which are so freely given to our Romish brethren. Why is jealousy to be exercised only towards protestants, and almost exclusively towards presbyterians? Why are we alone to be excluded from all the advantages of the spirit, liberality, and charity, which our reformers have vainly contributed to originate and to foster? Why are *we*, their posterity, who cling, it may be, with an over-fond tenacity to their opinions, to be denied the benefits of that very inheritance they purchased for us with tears and blood? Are we *alone* prone to illiberality, and have Romanists and prelatists become the exclusive possessors of all true charity? Are we so disinherited of our fathers' glory, and have popery and prelacy become so transformed, that whereas *they* are now the presiding genii of all true and genuine liberality, we are the very personification of harshness and bigotry?

And has it come to this, that while the sworn subjects of a foreign prince, who claims over them *infallible* as well as *despotic* authority, are to be allowed all liberty to

* McCrie's Life of Knox, vol. ii. p. 25.

propagate their unchristian tenets, to defame protestantism, and constantly to ANATHEMATIZE and CURSE us, all this is to be regarded as no more than a just exercise of liberty and self-defence; while we, by whose principles this great republic was originated, and is upheld, are to be reprobated as bigots, and to be heard with the ear of a closed incredulity, when we venture to assert the irreconcilableness of *unchanged and European* popery with true christianity, or with genuine liberty, and when we would warn the republic of those dangers with which, *on this account*, its stability and happiness are threatened? May God forbid.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CATHOLICITY OF PRESBYTERY.

SECTION I.

The catholicity of presbytery in its ecclesiastical system, in contrast with popery and prelacy.

THE polity of the christian church was modelled, as we have already proved, after the discipline of the Jewish synagogue. That system, which seems to have been a development of the simpler and more catholic service of the patriarchal dispensation, was permitted, by divine providence, if not, as is probable, by express divine teaching, to run parallel with the national and typical dispensation of Moses, until it became merged in the christian economy.* The chief characteristics of this system were the simplicity of its rites, and the consequent facility with which it could be reduced to practice in any part of the world. It was not Jewish, like the Mosaic ritual, but universally applicable, under whatever form of civil government it might be introduced. It thus stood in direct contrast to the temple service, which was strictly national and sectarian, and admitted of no alliance or intermixture with any other polity or government. While therefore the temple had its lineal order of priests, and its prescribed

* Nolan's Cath. Char. of Chr. p. 191. See also Scott. Chr. Herald, for 1839, pp. 627, 653, &c. Brown's Vind. of Presb. Ch. Govt. p. 269. Plea for Presbytery, pp. 316, 322.

and unalterable ceremonies and forms of consecration, the ministers of the synagogue were of no particular tribe or lineage, but were received according to the judgment of its rulers, and by the simple rite of imposition of hands. The sacerdotal service, by being restricted to Jerusalem, was, in this way, prepared for abrogation, while the synagogue service was as plainly capable of extension to every clime, and was therefore truly catholic.

By a strange fatuity, however, that church which arrogates to itself the exclusive attribute of catholicity, has assumed, as its exemplar and standard, the partial, narrow, and sectarian model of the temple service; while we, to whom the very name of catholic is most bitterly denied by this arrogant sect, have in every thing practicable, conformed our polity to the popular, free, and catholic system of the synagogue. In the prelacy, accordingly, we find every thing aristocratic, illiberal, and exclusive, with a correspondent imitation of the splendid ceremonies and external rites of the extinct Mosaic institute, in its priests, altars, and sacrifices; while presbyterianism is found rejecting all such burdensome and unprofitable forms, and at once enlarging itself to the full amplitude of the most comprehensive and catholic principles. We have neither priests, altars, sacrifices, nor mediators, but ministers only; whose great business and duty it is, to lead their hearers to the one mediator, who has made the only available sacrifice, 'once offered upon the cross,' — the only altar recognised by christianity. Any attempt to restore such a burdensome ceremonial, which was imposed upon the Jews *for their hardness of heart*, must be regarded as equally profane and anti-christian, since it was by its entire removal christianity was enabled to diffuse itself with illimitable freedom. All unnecessary ceremonies serve as a pale to religion, by which its compass is limited, and its diffusion restricted; and their introduction into a religion designed to be universal, is therefore clearly incompatible with its very nature.

There are thus, as presbyterians believe, but two sacramental rites instituted by Christ, the one as a medium of initiation, and the other of communion ; both remarkable for their significance, their simplicity, and their adaptation to persons of all ages and countries, — purification by water, and sustenance by bread and wine, being customs universally familiar.*

As the light of nature teaches that there is a God, and that he is to be worshipped, so will that form of worship instituted by God, and limited by his revealed will, be found to be the simplest that can be conceived, and most contrary to the devices and imaginations of men, who are never satisfied without ceremonies equally formal, gorgeous, and burdensome. Religious worship is therefore to be given to God, — the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, — and to Him alone, and not to angels, saints, or any other creature ; neither is God to be worshipped by any visible representation, or in any way not prescribed in Scripture. Prayer with thanksgiving ; the reading of the Scriptures with godly fear ; the sound preaching of the gospel and conscionable hearing of the word, with understanding, faith, and reverence ; singing of psalms with grace in the heart ; as also the due administration of the sacraments instituted by Christ ; are all parts of the ordinary religious worship of God ; besides religious oaths and vows, solemn fastings and thanksgivings upon special occasions, which are in their several times and seasons, to be used in a holy and religious manner.† Neither are prayer or any other parts of religious worship now under the gospel, either tied unto, or made more acceptable, by any place in which they are performed, or toward which they are directed, so as to make any gorgeous or consecrated temple essential and requisite ; but God is equally present wherever he is sought, and is every where to be worship-

* Nolan, as above, p. 244.

† Conf. of Faith, ch. xxi.

ped in spirit and in truth ; as in private families daily, and in secret each one by himself, so more solemnly in public assemblies *

Such being the simple ritual of the christian worship, as drawn forth in the standards of our church, and its perfect adaptation to the universal family of man, in whatever stage of civilization men may be found ; the designed extension of these privileges of the christian church is plainly not less œcumenical. The visible church to which these ordinances are given, is truly catholic or universal, embracing all those throughout the world, of whatever name, age, condition, talent, or rank, that may at any time or manner be led to embrace the true religion, together with their children.† Such is our idea of the church, and beyond this nothing more comprehensive can be possibly conceived. It is the one entire body of which Christ is the head, and of which all are members who have been participants of his one Spirit of grace. It is the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God ; including every son and daughter of Adam who have been called to the knowledge of his truth, and excluding none, by whatever name they are called, who profess to be subject unto Him. It is characterized by universality, unity, and the widest charity, and is infinitely removed from sectarianism, exclusiveness, and bigoted and intolerant illiberality.

Nor will this comprehensive and catholic character of the church, as understood by presbyterians, be at all abridged when we contemplate the officers by whom its discipline is administered. Repudiating as judaical and antichristian, the whole theory of a hierarchical caste or priesthood, who constitute in fact the church, and to whom all its authority and privileges are made, of right, to belong ; we believe that it was unto the catholic visible church,

* See Nolan's Conf. of Faith, ch. xxi.

† Ibid, ch. xxv.

composed of children and adults, as above described, that Christ gave the ministry, oracles, and ordinances. We believe that it was for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, and not for their own honor, emolument, or dignity, this ministry was instituted; and that it is by no power, sanctity, or priestly mediation on their part, but by Christ's presence and Spirit, according to his promise, these ordinances are made effectual to the accomplishment of the glorious purpose, of uniting all saints to Jesus Christ their head.* The ministry was given to and for the church, and presupposes its existence;—the church was not ordained for the benefit and glorification of the ministry. All the power, authority, jurisdiction, and influence of the ministry, come to it therefore through the church—the body—according to the appointment of Christ the Head. The ordinary and perpetual officers of the church, are therefore only bishops or pastors; the ruling elders; and deacons. But each one of these has exclusive reference to the edification and welfare of the christian people. Bishops, by whatever title they are denominated, or their duties characterized, are the overseers, pastors, ministers, messengers, of the people, deputed by Christ to dispense to them the manifold grace of God, and to act, for them, as stewards of the mysteries of his kingdom. Ruling elders are the representatives of the people, chosen by them, and set apart to watch over their interests in conjunction with the pastors. While deacons have no other duties than to take care of the poor, to distribute among them collections raised for their use, and to superintend the temporal affairs of the church.

Now it is manifest, that wheresoever God by his Spirit gathers together a congregation of faithful men, to profess the truth, and to submit themselves to his ordinances, there may these officers be easily and certainly obtained.

* Conf. of Faith, ch. xxv.

If no regularly constituted body is at hand to provide them with a bishop, they can elect one of their number, after seeking guidance from on high, to minister unto them in holy things. They can as certainly choose out from among themselves holy and competent men to act for them as their elders and deacons. And thus does it appear how christianity, as described in the Bible, and developed in presbyterianism, is at once capable of extension to the widest circumference of humanity, and how it contains within itself the germinant principles of vitality, diffusion, unity, and universality.

The catholic character of the presbyterian church, considered as an ecclesiastical system, is thus seen in her constitution. She does not proclaim herself to be 'the church,' or 'the catholic church,' but to be a component part of that universal church, of which there can be but one, the aggregate of all. Wherever there are true christians, there is the church, and there are members of the universal or catholic church. Christian unity, therefore, is to be found not in any uniformity of outward order, or subjection to any external authority, but in the participation of 'the one spirit,' of 'the one baptism,' by which all are initiated into it, and of 'the one faith.*' There must, of necessity, be local and national divisions, and parties. While the family of man is locally divided, there must be 'different provincial and local churches.†' There cannot, therefore, be *visible* union. But there may be unity among these separate denominations, even where there cannot be a consolidated ecclesiastical government; just as our division into families, districts, and states, does not prevent our national union as a republic. We do not lose our individuality or independent sovereignty, in any of these respects, by our confederation for the advance-

* Eph. 4:16. See Nolan's Cath. Char. of Christ. pp. 81, 97, 99. Also pp. 90-94.

† Mr. Sibthorp's Letter, p. 25.

ment of interests common to all alike. And in like manner, we do not cease to be christian, and therefore catholic when we become presbyterian, or methodist, or any other *essentially* scriptural denomination.

Presbyterians do not, however, regard ecclesiastical government as a matter of indifference.* ‘On the contrary, it has a close connection with purity of doctrine, rigor of discipline, peace and order. Every society, then, and every individual, as he has opportunity, is bound to make the principles of ecclesiastical polity, laid down in the New Testament, a subject of careful examination. All forms of church government are to be compared with the standard of truth, and that particular one adopted which comes nearest to the principles contained in the Holy Scriptures.’ ‘But when it is said that the constitution of the church has been drawn up in the scriptures, it is not meant that this is done in a regular and formal way, as in ordinary constitutions. All that is done in the New Testament, is the laying down of fundamental principles; the particular form and application of which is left to the church. The true spirit of these principles must never be violated; but under this restriction there is some latitude, which may bring societies of different forms within the pale of the universal church. If this is not admitted, we must cut off from the church, and from the covenanted mercies of God, societies of all the different forms except one—and the difficult question must be decided which one is *that*? Every different denomination will maintain, in this case, its apostolical purity, and excommunicate every other. Thus the bond of brotherhood will be broken asunder, and the reproach of christianity will be perpetuated. The presbyterian church in the United States has determined, that this evil shall not

* Dr. Rice, in *Evang. Mag.* ix. 306, 307.

stain her escutcheon. 'Let brotherly love continue,' is the motto on her banner!''*

Such is presbyterianism. It is a stand for the sufficiency of Scripture, and the supremacy of Christ; for liberty of private judgment, and of individual practice; for the recognition of all as christian brethren, 'who hold the Head;' for mutual tolerance in matters of secondary importance, where there is unity in that which is essential; for that universal communion of all christians, which is the only substantial, visible, and possible unity; and the unrestricted intercourse of ministers and churches, notwithstanding their diversity in forms and ceremonies. To make uniformity of discipline, the measure of christian unity, and the basis of christian communion and fellowship, is to put church order in the place of christianity, and the form of the building in the place of Him who built it. 'Christ must be first, fellowship next, and then as much uniformity as will follow from the two.' This is the principle and the spirit of presbyterianism; 'and hence, instead of being schismatical, it has less of sectarianism, and more of catholicity, than any other system whatever.'† While we claim for our own order and polity a near conformity to the scriptural platform, we nevertheless hold that in those things that *essentially* belong to divine worship, all *real* christians are agreed, and that in those things which appertain *essentially* to the nature of church discipline, all denominations concur. If *outward* uniformity be the chief good, let it be sought in Romanism. There may the inquirer find quiet silence, and the most passive obedience. But the man who is distracted by the bustling activities and jarring interests of the living

* See Form of Govt. ch. i. 5. Also in her Confession of Faith, ch. xxvi. 2.

† See Binney's Dissent not Schism, p. 70.

world, may find as reasonable a retreat in the church-yard, or the sepulchre. The dead are quiet enough.*

Our very name, for we have none other than christian, manifests our catholicity. We are presbyterians only from our position and circumstances, as we protest against those who usurp the rights of presbyters, and enthrone themselves over them in despotic supremacy. This title we bear in our modern reformation, as a public attestation to the truth, that the true, original, and apostolic episcopacy, was presbytery. But we are not presbyterians, except as a part of our character is put for the whole, — we are presbyterian christians. We are in short presbyterian, because we are bible and apostolic christians. We are not even catholics, a name appropriated by every sect, as by the ancient Arians; by the Greek church, and by the Donatists; and a title which could not have been applied to the christian church, until, by her extension, the christian faith had been generally if not universally preached throughout the world. In the beginning, therefore, as some Romanists confess, the church was not called catholic, while many of those bodies which were afterwards known by this title are now adjudged to be guilty of schism and heresy.† We bear the names of no earthly leaders, as the Lutherans, Zuinglians, Arminians, Benedictines, Franciscans, Dominicans,

* ‘With as good a plea,’ says Milton, (*Reason of Ch. Govt. Wks.* vol. i. p. 103,) ‘might the dead palsy boast to a man, it is I that free you from stitches and pains, and the troublesome feeling of cold and heat, of wounds and strokes; if I were gone, all these would molest you. The winter might as well vaunt itself against the spring, I destroy all noisome, and rank weeds, I keep down all pestilent vapors; yes, and all wholesome herbs, and all fresh dews, by your violent and hide-bound frost; but when the gentle west winds shall open the fruitful bosom of the earth, thus overgirded by your imprisonment, then the flowers put forth and spring, and then the sun shall scatter the mists, and the manuring hand of the tiller shall root up all that burdens the soil, without thank to your bondage.’ See also Herschel’s *Letter to Sibthorp*, p. 38.

† See *Notes of the Ch. Examined*, pp. 73, 75.

Jansenists, Molinists, and Papists; nor are we denominated, from any earthly country or kingdom, as the Roman, or the Anglican churches. One is our master, even Christ. Our kingdom is not of this world, nor our doctrine of man, and therefore do we bear Christ's name, as did the disciples at Antioch; while at the same time, we are not unwilling to hold forth our specific distinction amid the other branches of the church, and to be called The Church Presbyterian. Christian is our name, and presbyterian our surname.

Even, however, as presbyterian, we can present the most irrefragable arguments for our true catholicity. Does Catholicity imply priority? Dr. Edwards,* a very learned episcopalian divine of the reign of Queen Anne,† after a careful examination of the several texts bearing on the subject, draws the following conclusion: 'thus we can show the time when WE ARE SURE THERE WAS A PRESBYTERY; BUT WE CAN'T SAY THERE WAS EPISCOPACY at THAT TIME IN THE CHURCH. This is owned by some of the most celebrated writers of our church; and even Mr. Dodwell, who was thought by his friends to be as able a defender of episcopacy as any they had, confesses there were no such fixed rulers as bishops in the church at first. (De Jure Laic. cap. 3, § 14.) Dr. Whitby shows the same, and is as large in the proof of it, (Ann. on 1 Thess. ch. 5.) Dr. Edwards then goes on to chastise a confident braggadocio, the author of the 'Rehearsal,' and asks, 'where, then, is our great boaster, who challenges all mankind to prove that presbyters were made before bishops? Is it not plain, from all the afore-cited scriptures, namely, Acts 11: 29, 30; Acts 14: 23; Acts 15: 2, 4, 6, 22, 23; Acts 16: 4; Acts 20: 17, 28; and Titus, 1: 5; James, 5: 4; 1 Peter, 5: 1; and the suffrage of episcopal writers themselves, that presbyters had the

* See in Lect. in Apost. Succ. p. 136.

† Theolog. Ref. vol. i. p. 523.

start of bishops, whatever this pretender makes a show of, and notwithstanding his telling us, that this is the single point on which the whole controversy depends? If it be so, he must own himself baffled, and all his pretensions are empty and insignificant.'

Does catholicity imply apostolicity? Every church, as we have seen, constituted by the apostles, was presbyterian. Does it imply universality? We challenge the production of a diocesan church or bishop, for more than two centuries, perhaps we might say three, of the christian era. Does it imply continued succession from the apostles? No one has ever questioned the uninterrupted succession from the apostles' time till now, of the order of presbyters. Does it imply uniformity? On this point of presbyterian order, all those have agreed, who in every age have maintained the gospel pure, entire, and uncorrupted. Does it imply majority in the votes of all existing christian bodies? Four fifths of all these go for presbyterianism, and against the exclusive assumptions of the Romish hierarchy.*

On the other hand, it may be shown, that the Romish church is not catholic; that in those very points in which she places most confidence, she is identified with 'the man of sin and mystery of iniquity,' and that, in her opposition and contumelies, we have the brightest evidence of our catholicity. The church of Rome, says bishop Bull,† has quite altered the primitive ecclesiastical government, changed the primitive canon or rule of faith, and miserably corrupted the primitive liturgy, or form of divine worship. 'I have,' says he, 'gone through the several heads of discourse which I proposed to myself, and sufficiently, I

* See Presbytery and not Prelacy the Scriptural and Primitive Polity.

† Corruptions of the Ch. of Rome, II, in Vind. of Ch. of Eng. pp. 159, 163, 243, 261.

think, proved, that the church of Rome hath altered the primitive ecclesiastical government; changed the primitive canon or rule of faith; and, lastly, miserably corrupted the primitive liturgy and form of divine worship. For these reasons laid together, I can never be induced to enter into the communion of the Roman church, as now it is; and for the same reason, (to speak my mind freely,) I wonder how so learned a man as Monsieur de Meaux, can, with a good and quiet conscience, continue in it.

Now, what bishop Bull has proved by the full establishment of these charges against the church of Rome, has also, we believe, been made good against the prelacy in the present and preceding works. By the introduction of her spiritual despotism, by making her bishops governors of the whole church, and all other pastors to be but their vicars and substitutes, she, too, has quite altered the primitive ecclesiastical government. By binding upon the church a stated liturgy, by introducing prayers for the dead, and by re-adopting many of the forms, rites, and ceremonies of the Romish church, derived through her from paganism, she has greatly perverted the apostolic form of worship. And as that church which has altered the ecclesiastical government and form of worship prescribed by the apostles, either by adding to, or by taking from them, cannot, *so far forth*, be a true, pure, apostolical, and catholic church, therefore must we exclude the papacy and the prelacy from the full application of this term. Whereas, the presbyterian church, abiding as she does, in all things, by the model of the apostolic churches, and by their form and order of worship, is truly catholic.

Again, is all christian unity centred in Christ, the head of the entire body of the Church? — then is that catholicity wanting in the papacy, which makes the pope or a general council, the head and centre of all churches, — then is that catholicity found in presbyterianism which main-

tains that 'there is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ, nor can the pope of Rome, in any sense, be head thereof.'* Is the cementing bond of catholicity derived from that 'One Spirit,' which is 'the Spirit of Christ,' and of which, through Him, all the members of the church are made partakers?—then is not the papacy or the prelacy catholic, since they teach us to find this bond of unity in the pope or the prelates; then is the presbyterian church catholic, since it teaches that Christ 'doth by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make the ministry, ordinances, and oracles of God effectual to the gathering and perfecting of the saints.'† Does catholicity require that the truth, which is the nourishment of the church, should be equally open to all? Then is it not found in the Romish or prelatic churches, which shut it up in the granaries of their own ecclesiastical traditions and priestly interpretation; but in the presbyterian church, which teaches that 'God's word is truth,' that 'all scripture is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, that men of God may be thoroughly furnished unto every good work;' and which invites all to 'search the scriptures,' and to eat 'the living bread.' Does catholicity demand a ritual, adapted to all classes and conditions of men, and in their native tongue, so that all may learn in their own language, the wonderful works of God?—then, surely, it is not found in prelacy, which is adapted only to the educated classes of society;‡ nor in popery, which makes 'ignorance the mother of devotion,' and an unknown tongue the vehicle of instruction; but in presbytery, which comprehends in its wide embrace all nations, all ages, all conditions, and adapts itself with facility to every modification of the human mind, and to every stage of civilization and refinement, and which proclaims to every

* Conf. of Faith, ch. xxv. sect 6.

† Ibid, sect. 3.

‡ Lond. Quart. Rev. Dec. 1839, p. 75.

man, in his own vernacular language, the glorious gospel of the grace of God. Does catholicity imply the necessity of ordinances which depend, not upon the technical validity of official administration, or the good pleasure of a prelatic aristocracy, but upon the operation of that one and the self-same Spirit, which is imparted alike to all?—then can it never be found in the *opus operatum* sacraments of men, but in the simple ordinances of heaven. Does catholicity further suppose the most perfect adaptation to missionary enterprise?—‘the prelacy,’ says Rhe-
nius, ‘is not fitted for missionary effort;’* and the papacy, we know, has only succeeded by accommodating itself to the kindred superstitions of paganism; while presbytery is, by its very constitution and design, a church of extension, a system not of rules, but of principles, whose progress has been sometimes in opposition to the ruling powers, sometimes in concurrence with them, yet always reaching forth from sea to sea, and from the rivers unto the ends of the earth. Does catholicity also necessarily involve the existence of some common rule or standard of faith and practice, a rule made by one that is above all, and whose authority is acknowledged by all, and which is alike open to all? Such a rule papists have not, since they have heaped together whole volumes of decrees and councils in this yet unsettled controversy; such a rule prelatists have not, since their tradition and canons cannot be universally known, understood or read, by all; but such a rule presbyterians have, ‘in holy Scripture, or the word of God, written and given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life; so that the infallible rule of interpretation of scripture is scripture itself.’† Finally, does catholicity require a catholic governor or judge in all controversies and of all destinies?—we find it not in the unde-

* Churchman’s Monthly Rev. June, 1841, pp. 342, 346.

† Conf. of Faith, ch. i.

terminated and contradictory decrees of discordant popes, councils, and convocations; — the supreme Judge, by whom all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other, as our church teaches, but the Holy Spirit speaking in the scripture.*

The following sentiments are from M. de Martin, a celebrated Romanist.† ‘ True christianity is not only anterior to catholicism, but also to the name of christianity itself . . . Christianity is the domain of freedom and of liberty ; catholicism is only the seminary of christianity ; it is the domain of the rules and discipline of conversion. . . . Christianity fills all the earth equally with the Spirit of God. Catholicism fills only one part of the globe. . . . christianity dilates and extends the use of our intellectual faculties. Catholicism contracts and circumscribes the exercise of these same faculties. . . . Christianity has excited no war, except against sin : catholicism has excited it against men, &c.’ . . . ‘ Now,’ adds M. Villers, ‘ it was against catholicism (that is, Romanism,) and in favor of true christianity, that the reform was undertaken.’

What, then, let us ask, are the boasted vouchers of our assailants for their claim to the monopoly of divine grace, and of all catholicity ? Prelatists are, we are told, the most numerous and comprehensive — but ‘ the whore sitteth on many waters,’ and ‘ the waters are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.’ They are the most powerful ; but ‘ the great city, (that is, Babylon,) reigneth over the kings of the earth.’ They are patronized by kingly and noble favor ; — but ‘ the kings of the earth have commit-

* Conf. of Faith, ch. i. sect. 10. See Baxter's Wks. vol. xvi. pp. 334, - 354.

† Le Min. de l'homme esprit, in Villers on the Ref. Lond. 1805, p. 11.

ted fornication, and lived deliciously with her.' They manifest unbroken uniformity and unquestioning obedience ; — ' the kingdom of the beast was full of darkness.' They proclaim austerities, penances, fastings, and total abstinence from lawful pleasures ; — but is not the apostacy described by ' forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving ? ' They put down the liberty of reason, conscience, and individual opinion ; — that is, ' he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.' They have been always visible in the glory, power, and pomp of hierarchical splendor, but the true church ' fled from the dragon into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God.' They are now flushed with the hope of again crushing all dissentients ; — but ' power is given to the beast over kindreds, and tongues, and nations ; all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him,' but ' the remnant of the woman's seed keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.' There stands the system in the prophetic mirror of the unerring word, and by this word is it judged, convicted, and condemned.*

Are we every where spoken against, as heretical and schismatical ? We may remember, to our great comfort and joy, of what church our Saviour said, that they should be reviled and reproached, and have all manner of evil said against them, and how literally these predicted sayings were fulfilled in the experience of the apostolic churches.† Luke 6 : 26, 22 : 23. 1 Pet. 4 : 14. Math. 5 : 11. 1 Cor. 1 : 23.

* See Hamilton on Missions, pp. 117, 119, 141.

† ' As for those terrible names of sectaries and schismatics, (Milton's Wks. vol. i. pp. 104, 105,) which ye have got together, we know your manner of fight ; when the quiver of your arguments, which is ever thin, and weakly stored, after the first brunt is quite empty, your course is to betake ye to your other quiver, of slander, wherein lies your best archery.'

The apostles and primitive christians, says Dr. Rice, were *dissenters*, in the fullest sense of that term ; and were treated, both by Jews and Gentiles, as hardly as any high churchmen have ever treated those who have borne the name in modern times.*

Take the word catholic, therefore, in its primary meaning in application to the church, as 'consisting of all' nations, and the presbyterian church is most evidently catholic, since it opens its arms to embrace all, of all nations, whether Jew or Gentile, who will enter into it. Take the term catholic in that sense in which it is descriptive of the church, considered as the union of all particular churches under one divine Head, for so, 'says bishop Sherlock, the catholic church signifies in ancient writers,'† and how loudly does the presbyterian church proclaim her catholicity in that protest which she enters against any exclusive appropriation of the blessings of salvation ; in that liberality of feeling, with which she fraternizes with all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in truth and sincerity ; and in that claim which she advances, to be recognised as a branch of the one, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

SECTION II.

The catholicity of presbytery, in its doctrinal system, in contrast with popery and prelacy. .

We have now considered the claim of the presbyterian church to the character of catholicity, considered in its

* Evang. and Lit Mag. vol. ix. p. 421.

† See in do. p. 14.

ecclesiastical system; but this application of the term catholic, though now the most essential in hierarchical vocabularies, was, in the view of that very antiquity, which is gifted by them with infallibility, a subordinate and undervalued signification. According to antiquity, the church is distinguished as *catholic* by its faith, as *particular* by its form of government. ‘Wherever,’ says Ignatius, ‘Christ is, there is the catholic church.’* He defines *a church* by its form of government, but *the catholic church* by consent of doctrine.† The language of Tertullian is equally definite.‡ Augustine,§ in his questions on Matthew, says, ‘These are good catholics, who follow the entire faith and a good practice.’

The term catholic, therefore, has nothing to do with *ages* and *nations*, but an individual is catholic, and a church is catholic, that adheres to the *general rule* of faith, adoring one Lord, observing one baptism, and holding to one doctrine. A church which has maintained such a profession for eighteen centuries, and in all nations, is not more catholic than was the church of Jerusalem in the first century, and in the province of Judea, or than is some presbyterian church in the nineteenth century, and in some remote locality.|| True catholicity is therefore synonymous with orthodoxy.

The last claimant to its possession, comes to it under the same conditions required of its first inheritor. Prelational dignity can give no right, nor length of succession any prescription, against ‘the truth as it is in Jesus.’ The first and the last hold by the same tenure. Catholicity where there is not divine truth, is an absurdity, and divine

* Ep. ad Smyrn. § 8.

† See Burgess's Tracts, p. 275, and Ad. Trall. § 3.

‡ De Baptismo, c. xvii. See above. That the fathers commonly used the term in the sense of orthodox, see bishop Beveridge's Wks. vol. ii. p. 197. Sherlock, in Notes of the Ch. Exam. p. 13.

§ In Blair's Wald. vol. ii. p. 524.

|| See Burgess, as above, p. 293.

truth without catholicity, is equally preposterous. To assert the contrary is blasphemy. A hierarchy may claim, or a prelatical succession boast of, the character of catholicity, but a church 'holding forth the truth,' can alone derive the title from the God of truth. And to suppose that catholicity is withheld from such a church, or given to any other body, is absurd impiety, and a contradiction in terms. As nobility in some countries, as in China, mounts upwards, so that he who has it conferred upon him ennobles his ancestors, not his posterity, so does the steadfast profession of the true doctrines of scripture, impart the character of catholicity to all who hold it, and to all their spiritual ancestry. Prelatists, therefore, use the word catholic in a sense, directly opposed to that given to it by the Anglican and other reformers.*

That church, then, which adds to or takes from the faith as once delivered to the saints, so far forth ceases to be catholic. Now the Romish and Anglican churches *have* altered the scriptural rule of faith. This they have done by adding many new articles; by adding to the catholic rule of faith one entirely different, even the traditions and authority of the church; and by explaining articles in that catholic creed, in a new, sectarian, and uncatholic sense.† That these churches hold such articles of faith as are additional, not to say contradictory, to the catholic rule, we must now assume as having been abundantly demonstrated, and at once apparent.§ For that church which holds to the Apostles' creed and the Nicene creed, holds those truths which, by consent of all christians, in the first ages of the church, were alone fundamental, and

* See Goode's Div. Rule of Faith, vol. i. xii.

† See this charge fully sustained by bishop Bull, in his *Vindication of the Ch. of Engl.* (Oxf. ed.) pp. 112–114, 113, 114–117, 123, 149, 167, 216.

‡ See bishop Bull, *ibid*, pp. 121, 178, 183, 186, 192, 202, 204, 219, 230.

therefore catholic. These constituted for ages the symbols or formularies of the church catholic. This position is fully sustained by our opponents, and established by their own antiquity. Thus the third general council, that of Ephesus, decreed,* ‘that it should not be lawful for any one to produce, write, or compose any other creed besides that which was agreed on and defined by the holy fathers, who were met together at Nice, by the Holy Spirit; and those who should dare to compose, produce, or offer any other creed to such as desired to return to the knowledge of the truth, from Paganism, Judaism, or any heresy whatsoever, should, if bishops, be deposed from their episcopal throne; if inferior clergymen, deprived of holy orders; if laymen, excommunicated, or cast out of the church.’† The whole canon is remarkable, and very much to our purpose; but we are especially to observe those words, ‘or from any heresy whatsoever.’ For hereby the Ephesian Fathers declare, ‘that if any person was charged with any kind of heresy whatsoever, he should sufficiently purge himself by the acknowledgement of the aforesaid creed; and that upon his subscription thereunto, or profession thereof, he should be absolved, and received into the communion of the church as a complete and perfect catholic; and that whoever should propose to such a person, any thing else to be believed, as a necessary condition of ecclesiastical communion, should himself be liable to the censure of the church.’

This position, so clearly assumed by antiquity, is sustained not only by prelatists generally, but by the Council of Trent itself.‡ ‘In their third session, before they come to define any one particular article, they declare it necessary, after the pattern (forsooth) of the ancient Fathers

* See bishop Bull, *ibid*, pp. 104, 105.

† See in *ibid*, pp. 113, 114, and Cummings’s *Apol. for Ch. of Scotl.* p. 7.

‡ Bishop Bull, *ibid*, pp. 116, 117.

and Councils, (whom they have imitated not half so well as an ape doth a man,) to premise the symbol, or rule of faith, used in the holy church of Rome, (which is indeed the creed of Constantinople,) and beginning with these words, ‘I believe in one God,’ and this creed they judge necessary to be in so many express words professed by their whole assembly, as ‘the principle wherein all christians, that profess the faith of Christ, do necessarily agree; and the only firm foundation, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail.’ Where, when they profess this creed to be the principle, wherein all christians do ‘necessarily agree,’ they plainly intimate, (if we poor protestants may presume to understand their meaning by their words,) that there is no absolute necessity that all christians should agree in other things. But their following words are express, wherein they acknowledge this creed to be ‘the only foundation,’ and, consequently, that nothing is to be laid as a foundation beside; nay, that this creed is ‘the only firm foundation, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail.’ For who would not here conclude, that, (by the confession of the Trent fathers themselves) whosoever fixeth his feet upon this foundation, and departeth not from any one article contained in this creed, stands sure, as to all points of faith, and is in no danger at all of damnation, or hell-fire, upon the account of heresy?’

‘They are true catholics, says Vincentius, in his famous rule, ‘who hold that which hath been believed always, every where, and by all.* Now what more we ask, as it regards the evidence of catholicity, what more can be demanded, than the articles contained in these early creeds? When we say nothing, we give the response of very high authorities in this matter.†

* Commonitorium. Eos proprie esse Catholicos, qui tenent id, quod semper, &c. creditum est.

† See bishop Williams, in Notes of the Ch. p. 116; Newman on Romanism and Dissent. *passim*.

The Romish and prelatic churches have, however, immeasurably widened the foundations of catholicity, and by widening have adapted them to the measure of their own sectarian and bigoted exclusiveness. For, to use the words of bishop Bull,* 'how prodigally doth this pack of bold and presumptuous men bestow their anathemas; thundering out hell and damnation to millions of pious souls, who stand firmly upon this only firm foundation, and cannot be proved to have denied any one point reducible or deducible from any article of the rule of faith.'

And how well has the Anglican prelacy bettered the instructions of her 'holy mother,' by her uncatholic and unrighteous decrees, canons, impositions, and anathemas; and driven from her bosom the millions that have come out from the midst of her, and who still protest against her tyrannous usurpation of the prerogatives of Christ.

On the other hand, the presbyterian church holds firmly to this ancient and catholic foundation of the faith. It is embodied in her confession;† it is made the basis of her definition, in the widest possible comprehension, of the visible catholic church;‡ and at no time have these doctrines, or any of them, been disowned or called in question by any public act of the entire body professing her principles. In fact the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian creeds are, the first verbatim, and the other two substantially, adopted by the presbyterian church.§ And while for the guidance of her own bishops and officers, our church has drawn forth other articles from the Scriptures, as the bond of *their* union, and a declaration *to* the people,|| she does not make these a term of church com-

* See bishop Williams, *ibid*, pp. 117, 118

† See *ibid*, p. 398.

‡ Conf. of Faith, ch. xxv.

§ See Cummings's Apol. for the Ch. of Scotland, p. 7.

|| Our Confession of Faith is not binding on the members, but only upon the ministers and officers of the church. It does not enforce every 'truth or duty,' as a term of communion. This, our church

munion, or essential either to the being of a church, or to the character of a true christian. She therefore opens her arms to the embrace of all who hold the Head, and welcomes them to a seat at her communion-table. In her creed, therefore, in her practice, and in her terms of christian communion, the presbyterian church is truly catholic. In this respect, the doctrines she proclaims are the same with those that patriarchs taught their families, prophets the people, apostles the nations, and Christ the world.* And even as it regards her more enlarged standards, it was the catholic intention and purpose of our church by framing her confession of faith, and by requiring subscription to it from all her ministers and officers, in this way most effectually to guard, preserve, and perpetuate the true faith and order of the gospel, — the primitive and apostolic inheritance, — and thus formally to maintain her connection with the church catholic, by retaining that — all that — and only that — which appertains to the church universal. And since scripture is ‘the depository of the will of our heavenly father,’† she has therefore gone to it for all her doctrines and institutions. She rests her claims to truth confessedly upon this divine testament, knowing that there is an essential difference between catholic truth, and individual opinion, by whatever fathers or doctors it may be held, or by whatever number of them it may have been expressed. To use a figure adopted by Dr. Wiseman; as the ancient Romans, who repaired and kept ever from destruction the cottage of Romulus, though, compared to later and more gorgeous edifices, it might appear useless and mean to the stranger that looked upon it, so have

never has done. (See Hodge’s Hist. of Presb. Ch. part ii. p. 330.) Nor does it consider even ministers worthy of suspension, except when convicted of ‘dangerous errors.’ (B. of Disc. ch. v. § 13, 14.) See also Hodge, vol. ii. p. 438.

* Cummings’s Apol. *ibid*, p. 10. See also Baxter’s Wks. vol. xvi. p. 287. Dr. Rice in Evang. Mag. 9, 192, &c.

† Dr. Pusey, in Library of the Fathers, vol. i. p. 4.

we ever held fast to the simplicity and purity of gospel truth. Well therefore may we take up the parable, and say to those who would appropriate to themselves the name and virtues of the catholic church, 'we have ten parts in the catholic church, and we have also more right in it than ye; — why do ye thus despise us?' *

* See Fulke. Conf. Rhem. N. T. Eph. 4: 13. p 258. Am. Ed.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SECURITY, SAFETY, AND EFFICIENCY OF PRESBYTERY.

THERE is perhaps no other argument, which has greater practical influence in favor of Romanists, than the allegation, that, even in the judgment of protestants, they must be on the safer side; and that, while they afford infallible certainty in matters of faith, the religion of protestants can afford no such certainty. These groundless assertions, for which there is no manner of support, have been most diligently repeated by prelatists, in application to the system of presbyterianism. Now the very reverse we believe to be the truth in the case. Protestants do not allow the prelacy of the church of Rome, or of England, to be the safer side, or a safe side at all; nor do they believe that it is able to give certainty in matters of faith. They believe, on the contrary, that the highest security and certainty are afforded by the presbyterian branch of the church catholic. That the Romish and the Anglican churches are both true, that is, *real* churches of Christ, and therefore integral portions of the catholic visible church, we cheerfully admit. In doing so, however, we stand upon the foundation laid in our Confession, and by which 'ALL who PROFESS the true religion, with their children,' constitute that church. But among the churches which compose this universal body, there is, manifestly, a great diversity of character, and of claims. Some are pure, some imperfect, some corrupt, and some false. By an imperfect church we understand, a church which continues steadfastly in the apostles' doc-

trines, teaching the pure word of God, and omitting no great and essential truth of the gospel; but in which the sacraments are not duly administered, or whose order, polity, and ministers, are not perfectly conformed to the scriptural model.

By a corrupt church we understand one, which, while it preserves the great and essential truths of the gospel, at the same time adds other things to these truths, which are not found in God's word, but are rather repugnant to the same; and thus, by human traditions, or any other spurious authority, makes vain the preaching of the truth, and corrupts the administration of divine ordinances.

By a false or apostate church we mean that church which lays any other foundation than Christ and his righteousness; which denies any of the great and essential doctrines of the word of God; or interprets the word of God according to its own vain imagination. Such a church, whatever else it may possess of order or discipline, and however it may claim the temple, the priesthood, antiquity, or succession, is a false church.*

By a pure church, again, we understand, a society whose confession of faith agrees with the doctrine of Jesus Christ and his apostles; and which is governed solely by the laws laid down in the word of God, or drawn from it by plain and necessary inference. The signs of such a church are soundness of doctrine; a lawful and regular ministry; the prevalence of love among its members and towards all saints; and the due administration of gospel ordinances, including discipline.†

We distinguish, therefore, between the being of a church, and its well-being; between its existence, and its integrity or perfection; between its essence, and its state or condition at any given period; in short, between that

* See the author's Eccl. Catechism, 2d ed, q. 30.

† Ibid, q. 31.

which is essential to its very existence, and those things which may be superadded by the pride, pomp, or circumstance, of vain-glorious man. Of all those things that do not absolutely belong to the essence of the church, but only to its state or condition, it may be wholly or in part deprived, without being destroyed, however grievously impaired.* It is thus we are able to recognise those bodies as, in their essence, churches, which we must, nevertheless, pronounce imperfect, corrupt, or false, in their state, condition, and superadded doctrines. Thus also are we enabled to hope that within the bosom of such churches there may be many who are true christians, and therefore members of the invisible church; and who, with more or less publicity, bear testimony against their errors. There is, however, great danger in being associated with such bodies, since the human mind, through the influence of depravity, has a natural and powerful affinity to error, by which it is strongly attracted; and an aversion to spiritual truth, by which it is repelled.

Such churches as are imperfect, may be improved; such as are corrupt, reformed; while such as are false, must be subverted and built anew upon the foundation of apostles and prophets. In the mean time, it is the duty of all to examine well the character and creed of the several churches claiming their adherence; to bring them to the law and the testimony; to search and try them, whether they speak and act according to the unerring word; to ascertain from the Scriptures, what is the orthodox faith, and thus to discover where that orthodoxy is maintained in greatest purity and power; and, if thus led to discover the corruption or apostacy of the church to which they belong, to come out from the midst of her, and be separate. And, as the essence of christianity consists in its doctrines, and not in its forms; as true apostolical suc-

* See Claude's Def. of the Ref. vol. ii. p. 209.

cession is found in the succession of the truth ; we are to estimate the character of any church by its doctrine, rather than by its polity. With a defective or unauthorized ministry, it may have pure doctrine, and thus be no more than imperfect. With the most legitimate and scriptural ministration, it may have corrupt doctrine, and thus be corrupt. Or it may have both false doctrines and unauthorized forms of polity, and in this case be openly apostate.

The Romish church, we are constrained to regard as a false and apostate church. We consider the prelatic church, in its high-church phase, as corrupt; the episcopal, in its low-church form, and other churches, as imperfect; and the presbyterian, though not absolutely perfect, as a true and pure church of Jesus Christ. We can truly and justly glorify God for all that which makes up the essence of a true church; our faith is sound, our piety is pure, our charity is sincere; and God preserves and upholds, in the external communion of our church, those truly faithful and regenerated persons, who constitute the members of the true church.* Our church unites in its constitution three great elements, nowhere else to be found in such full combination, and is at once orthodox, apostolical, and protestant. It is orthodox, or catholic, by the full profession of those early creeds, which embody the testimony of the truly primitive church; by upholding the sufficiency of the Scriptures, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice; and by rejecting all other doctrines and commandments of men. It is apostolical, by holding fast the profession of the apostles' doctrine, fellowship, and prayers, and to that order of ministry, and form of discipline, which they established. And it is protestant, by exhibiting most fully, in its con-

* That this was the opinion of the fathers, see proved by many quotations in Claude's *Def. of the Ref.* vol. ii, p. 213, &c.

fession and catechisms, the way in which truth must be applied unto the heart for salvation; bearing full witness to the righteousness of Christ, as the alone ground of pardon and acceptance with God; and to the influences of the Holy Spirit, as the only source of sanctification and holiness. Thus has God, of his singular goodness, combined in our church the three grand elements of purity and perfection; catholic orthodoxy, apostolical order, and protestant fidelity. She is not heretical, because she adheres to the faith once delivered to the saints. She is not schismatical, for she is not answerable for those corruptions, impositions, and anathemas, which separated her from the papacy and the prelacy. 'She is not a usurper; her faith has been professed for eighteen centuries; her polity was established in Jerusalem, the mother of all churches, and at Antioch, the mother of all Gentile churches; and both have been maintained, throughout the world, by the earliest, the best, and the purest churches. She is not deficient in means of grace, since she possesses all the privileges of the church; enjoys all the spiritual gifts, promised by Christ to those who seek them; and inherits from Christ's divine charter all the functions of the christian ministry. She is not wanting in authority, for to her belong the authority of apostolical origin, succession, and mission; the ministerial administration of Christ's laws and institutions; and the delegated power of proclaiming the truth as it is in Jesus. She is not found wanting in the certainty with which she fulfils her high office as an ambassador for Christ, the pillar and ground of the truth, since in her rule of faith there is all the certainty which rational beings can require.* We have the three creeds, which can derive no light from popes or councils, that we do not possess. We have our standards of faith, which were drawn up by the

* Burgess's Tracts, p. 307.

most learned men of a very learned age. And the right use of these means of faith, which a merciful Providence has given us, requires only the ordinary exercise of our rational faculties. We have, also, in those plain words of scripture, 'If thou wouldst enter into life, keep the commandments;' 'Do this, and thou shalt live;' 'Believe in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved;' 'Forgive, and thou shalt be forgiven;' 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do unto them;' infallible directions, both for faith and conduct.'

The presbyterian church is not more fallible than the church of Rome; but she is fallible, not because she is only *a part* of the church universal, but because it is the property of human nature to be fallible. The church of Rome has shown herself fallible in many things, and in nothing more than in that very pretence that she is infallible, and that she is not a part of the universal church, but the whole of it.

The presbyterian church does not pretend to be infallible; but her children have a confident reliance on this instruction, that 'if any one lack wisdom, let him ask of God, in faith, and it shall be given him;' and in Christ's promise of the assistance of God's Holy Spirit to them that ask him. They are, moreover, sure, that by such assistance, and by the sober use of the faculties which God has given them, they cannot be deceived in such things as most pertain unto salvation.*

Our church, therefore, has all the security which can be possibly enjoyed. She is built upon the rock. Her foundation was laid in the counsels of eternity, and completed by apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. Her walls are salvation. Her bulwarks are the sure testimonies of God. Her monuments and towers the everlasting promises. Her

* See *ibid*, *ibid*.

armory, the treasury of divine truth. Her provisions, the sure mercies of David—that covenant that shall never be broken. Her hope, the two immutable things which can never fail, the promise and the oath of God. Her anchor, therefore, is sure and steadfast, being entered within the vail. As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so is the Lord round about her, to send peace within her walls and prosperity within her palaces; so that even the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of his holiness. Beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, is Mount Zion. God is known in her palaces for a refuge. As we have heard, so have we seen in the city of the Lord of hosts, in the city of our God: God will establish her for ever. Selah. 'Let Mount Zion rejoice, let the daughters of Judah be glad, because of thy judgments. Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following. For this God is our God for ever and ever: he will be our guide even unto death.'

We had intended to go fully into this subject, did our limits permit. We were prepared to show, that the system of the presbyterian church is safer than either the Romish or the prelatic, because it holds most purely to the doctrines of the Bible; because it more clearly and fully proclaims the truth; because it affords better protection to the truth; because, as a church, it can be more certainly distinguished; because it possesses a ministry authorized by the commission and charter of Christ; because it maintains, with most fidelity and purity, the form of church order, government, and discipline, established by the apostles, and preserved by the first christians; because it is most adapted to promote spirituality; because it best secures purity of discipline; because it is found to

be most destructive to the principles of infidelity ; because it most properly administers the sacraments ; because it provides for greater unity ; because it is most conducive to the promotion of morality, and the prevention of crime ; because it is most efficient in its efforts for the extension of the church, and the evangelization of the world ; and because it is the most liberal and charitable.

We might also proceed to show how presbyterianism is favorable to the spread of light and knowledge, of civil and religious liberty — but we must forbear. Enough has been advanced to satisfy the most timid conscience, that, while we deny not the salvability of other communions, there is far greater safety and certainty to be found in the presbyterian church, than in either the Romish or prelatical. Holding the truth in its purity and its entirety ; proclaiming it clearly ; protecting it against all error ; securing most effectually the removal of heresy and error ; promoting most surely the revival of sound doctrine and holy practice ; perpetuating the apostolic ministry, orders, ordinances, and discipline, in all their simplicity and power ; providing for the greatest unity ; holding up a shield of defence against infidelity ; promoting spirituality ; devoted to the advancement of the cause and kingdom of Christ at home and abroad ; and doing all this in the spirit of true christian liberality ; the presbyterian church proves that she possesses the four great elements of catholicity, unity, publicity, popularity, and universal diffusiveness, and offers a sure and safe retreat to all who are inquiring the way to Zion. She is admirably qualified to instruct the ignorant, to enlighten those who are in darkness, to console the real penitent, to teach the way of salvation to the lost, to edify the believer in Christ, and to guide sincere inquirers to the attainment of everlasting life.

CONCLUSION.

WE have now endeavored to illustrate the catholicity and the liberality of presbytery ; and to show how, when weighed in the balances, it is not found wanting, but commends itself to universal approbation and favor. And as others have taken in hand to uphold the republicanism of opposing systems, we have examined into the true principles of republicanism, and demonstrated, we think, the perfect identity with it, of the principles of presbytery, which is the government of the people.

The presbyterian mode of discipline and government, besides its scriptural basis, recommends itself by the following arguments. It is founded essentially on the principle of representation, which pervades American society. It does not make all the members of a church judges ; but ‘sets those to judge who are most esteemed in the house of God.’ It presents a firm barrier against the ambition and encroachments of the clergy — for it unites with the minister a council of wise, prudent, and godly men, taken from the body of the communicants, without whose consent no measure can be carried. It furnishes one of the best securities for preserving the rights of both pastor and people ; for it provides to an individual of either order, who may suppose himself wronged, the opportunity of appealing to a higher tribunal, where his cause will be heard without local prejudice, by judicious, enlightened, and impartial men. It secures to ministers of the word and sacraments counsel and support in all their official proceedings, of the best possible kind ; for those who are associated with them are acquainted with the views of the people, participate in their feelings, and

are able to give sound advice as to the wisdom and practicability of those plans, which require general coöperation, for carrying them into effect. It possesses an advantage also on the score of despatch and energy, as well as of wisdom and the security of equal rights. It unites believers together in one body, and thus is friendly to the spread of the gospel, by furnishing facilities for efficient and coöperative action in promoting the great interests of the Redeemer's kingdom. The general assembly of the church presents the beautiful spectacle of the various members of one vast and extended society, meeting together by their representatives as one in Christ, to unite with heart and hand in the service of their Lord. Such is the system of presbyterian government.*

Presbyterianism, under God, making its appeal to the hearts of the people; resting its confidence upon the affections of the people; looking for its advancement to the activity and coöperation of the people; invoking in all its assemblies, from the least unto the greatest, the presence and counsel of the people; and throwing the responsibility of all its doings upon the equal and controlling voice of the people; is in perfect keeping with that government which glories in being the government of the people. Why has the presbyterian church surmounted every obstacle, and cleared her way through such a wilderness of impassable difficulties, to her present elevation and greatness? Because sustained by the nerves and the sinews of the people. And why has she not achieved still greater triumphs, and enrolled among her friends still greater multitudes? simply because depending, as has been said, upon the force and energy of the people, the engrossing interests of mercantile and agricultural pursuits have deprived her of that measure of

* Sketch of the Presbyterian Church in England.

zealous devotion to her cause, and coöperation in her designs, without which she cannot prosper. She is framed in adaptation to such an union of the people. She presupposes and requires it for her full development. She is, without it, but as a man with one arm, instead of two — she cannot accomplish even half what she might otherwise perform. Destitute of an intelligent, pious, and devoted eldership, the presbyterian church is seen as a powerful and athletic man whose arms are pinioned, or whose feet are in the stocks. Designed to promote the best interests, and to meet all the reasonable wishes, of her people, the responsibility of her failure, or success, rests mainly upon them. Yes, presbyterian laymen, upon you does it depend, whether this church shall go forward from strength to strength, or languish and decay. Your interest, your prayers, your activity, your liberality, your devotedness, in combination with a faithful ministry, and both blessed of God — this is all we have to look to for success. We claim, as ministers, no exclusive and official possession of the divine gifts. We pretend to no priesthood, to no sacrifice for sins, to no power of plenary absolution, to no authority to enforce confession, to no damnatory power beyond the grave. We are of you, and among you, and one with you, and desire that you should account of us as stewards of the mysteries of heaven, ambassadors for Christ, heralds of the cross, and your servants in the gospel.

The cause of Christ among you, is, therefore, thrown upon your best affections; upon your love, and not your fear; your gratitude, and not your terror; your hopes, and not your servile prostration; your liberality, and not your tithed assessments; your willing consecration, and not your slavish and blind obedience. Will you, brethren, abuse this great grace of God, or undervalue this heavenly birthright, or lightly esteem this august inheritance? May God forbid. Montesquieu has shown, that the prin-

ciple of a republic, or the spring by which it acts, is virtue—that is, as he understands the term, love of the established government of the republic—devotion to its interests, a preference of these interests by each individual to his own; in a word, what we call public spirit, or patriotism. In such a government, every man should feel, that in promoting the common weal, he is advancing his personal welfare; and should be actuated, therefore, not by the principle of fear, or penurious selfishness, but by love and a generous liberality. Now precisely similar is the constitution, and the principle, of our church. In preference to other churches, she founds her claims to the coöperation and assistance of all her members, upon the liberty and privilege she so abundantly confers.

Presbyterianism, to the carnal eye, does not present the same attractive form which is assumed by her prelatial rivals, who appear before their votaries in all the ‘pride, pomp, and circumstance,’ of ceremonial forms; but whatever influence over the ignorant and unthinking multitude may in this way be gained, is a dear purchase, when christian truth and duty, and charity, must be impaired for its sake.

We, christian brethren, and our fathers, have possessed a talent of unspeakable value. We have enjoyed, as a church, unlimited freedom and spiritual independence. We have no king but Christ. We call no man master upon earth. We are in subjection to no traditions of the fathers—nor to any will-worship, formality, and superstitions of men. We bow to no deified images. We cringe to no priestly mediators, and lick the dust of no wooden crucifixes. We are the Lord’s freemen. We are in bondage to no power on earth. We wear the livery of no spiritual despot. Our government is a government of written laws, and it is administered by our people themselves, without let, hindrance, or tyranny. This, brethren, is a great, a distinguishing privilege.

Of the two great branches of the Reformation in Europe, the Lutheran Churches, and the Reformed — the Lutheran had no spiritual independence, but were wholly subjected to the state. And of the four great Reformed Churches of France, Geneva, Holland, and Scotland, — the Protestant Church of France, planted by Calvin, has been laid waste by the persecution of anti-christ. Geneva is desolate by the withering pestilence of heresy, and the exclusion of the laity from her councils. Holland has been prostrated to the civil power. The Reformed National Church of Scotland has also been subjected to the vassalage of a state establishment, and to the corrupting influence of patronage, and is now, therefore, waging warfare for her usurped rights. In the prelatic churches every where, and of every name, the priesthood is every thing, and the people nothing. But we are free, we hold by the Head, we maintain professed allegiance to the King of kings, and King of saints. We alone renounce all interference of man, all submission to any earthly laws, and we alone can sit under our vine and fig tree, none daring to molest or make us afraid. The principles we maintain are the religious strength of the country; the grand bulwark that alone can arrest and drive back to their native regions, the pestilential heresies of Popery and Puseyism; and, in proportion as these principles, in harmony with evangelical piety, are understood, appreciated, and advanced, in the same degree will our national greatness and prosperity be secured. *‘Columbia sic stabit; Christique arx alta manebit.’*

We would impress upon the people the duty of taking interest in all the affairs of the church, of informing themselves fully of all the claims and advantages she confers, and of fitting themselves to give a reason of their ecclesiastical preference, to every man that asketh them. The life of our system is a spiritual life. It lies in the culture of the mind and heart — the reason and the con-

science. 'It is bound up in those principles which must be taught from father to son, from generation to generation, with care, with toil, with sacrifice.' It is a prize above all price. It is a heaven-descended gift, preserved and perpetuated by the blood of martyrs. It is an inheritance more valuable than that of houses or lands, of silver or gold, and which we are bound by every duty to ourselves, to our children, to our country, and to our God, to preserve and perpetuate at every sacrifice. It is a cause, again worthy of martyrdom. It is, brethren, your cause, and not the cause of your ministers. Let not the duty it imposes upon you, as individual christians, as deacons, elders, and officers, as active and efficient agents, as diligent and laborious Sabbath School teachers, as earnest instructors of your children and families in the history, principles, and reasons of our church government and doctrine — let not these be thought irksome. Let them not be regarded as secondary to what you call the more important interests of life. You are assuredly mistaken. In looking after business, you may be neglecting your chief business, which is to secure the liberties, civil and religious, of yourselves and your posterity. Without the active, zealous, and devoted cöoperation of all its members, our church may be compared to a human body, 'more perfect as to the skeleton, and more beautifully constructed than that of others, but which from languor of circulation is become somewhat feeble in muscle, incapable of throwing off peccant humors, and ill qualified for energizing with vigor, when compared with a frame less perfectly compacted, but possessing a more lively circulation, and a more elastic activity.' But let our church be supported by the hearty cöoperation of all its officers and members, and it will be found possessed of both these classes of advantages, without their corresponding deficiencies, and be mighty, through God, to the pulling down the strong-holds of sin and Satan.

APPENDIX.

THE PRACTICAL EFFICIENCY OF PRESBYTERY IN PROMOTING MORALITY AND PREVENTING CRIME.

THAT church may be regarded as the most safe and certain, which is found, in its practical working, most conducive to the promotion of morality and righteousness, and to the prevention of crime — ‘by their fruits ye shall know them,’ ‘for righteousness exalteth a nation.’ This is a very plain and practical test.

Now it is admitted by prelatists, that presbyterianism is at least as conducive to morality as any other system. ‘We know,’* says a recent able and candid episcopalian writer, ‘that there are, and have been, whole nations of professed Calvinists, who, in successive generations, have not appeared at all below their neighbors of other persuasions in the general tone of their morals.’

The doctrines of presbyterianism are adapted to lead to holiness, both of heart and life. Toplady testifies† to the superior power of his preaching, in *converting souls*, when he preached the Calvinistic system, than before; and, if conversion to God be the first and best security for individual holiness, and through it, national morality, it is plain that Calvinism must be considered the friend of both. He says, in 1774, ‘as to the doctrines of special and discriminating grace, I have thus much to observe, that for the first four years after I was in orders, I dwelt chiefly on the general outline of the gospel. I preached little else but of justification by faith only in the righteousness and atonement of Christ, and of that personal holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. My reasons for thus narrowing the truths of God, were, (with humiliation and repentance I desire to speak it,) these two: first, I thought these points were sufficient to convey as clear an idea as was absolutely necessary of salvation; and, second, I was partly afraid to go any farther. God himself (for none but he could do it) gradually freed me from that fear. And, as he never at any time permitted me to deliver, or even insinuate any thing contradictory to his truths, so has he been graciously pleased, for between seven and eight years past, to open my mouth to make known the entire mystery of his gospel, as far as his Spirit has enlightened me in it. The consequence of my first plan of operations was, that the generality of my hearers were pleased, *but very few were converted*. The result of my latter deliverance from worldly wisdom and worldly fear, is, that multitudes have been very angry. But the conversions which

* Christianity Indep. of the Civil Government, p. 46.

† In Lorrimer's Manual, p. 278.

God has given me reason to hope he has wrought, *have been at least three for one before*. Thus, I can testify, so far as I have been concerned, the usefulness of preaching predestination, or, in other words, of tracing salvation and redemption to their first source.*

In meeting the objection, that the Calvinistic doctrines tend practically to licentiousness, the Rev. Hugh White, curate in Dublin, says,† 'and here, it cannot surely but excite the unfeigned surprise of every unprejudiced mind, to observe that a directly contrary tendency is manifested in the strenuous upholders of the doctrines of free grace; and that, generally speaking, they are as much distinguished by their peculiar devotedness to the service of God, and the pursuit of holiness, as by the peculiar doctrines of their creed — so that, by a contradiction that would be amusing, were not the subject so serious, their doctrines are condemned as being too loose, and their lives as being too strict!'

Bishop Burnet says, 'a Calvinist is taught, *by his opinions*, to think meanly of himself, (how unlike the picture drawn by bishop Hughes!) and to ascribe the honor of all to God; which lays in him a deep foundation for humility; he is also much inclined to secret prayer, and to a fixed dependence on God.'

The article in the Encyclopedia Britannica on Predestination, contains these remarks. 'There is one remark, which we feel ourselves bound in justice to make, *although it appears to us somewhat singular*. It is this: that from the earliest ages down to our own days, if we consider the character of the ancient Stoics, the Jewish Essenes, the MODERN CALVINISTS and Jansenists, when compared with that of their antagonists, the Epicureans, the Sadducees, the Arminians, and the JESUITS, we shall find that they *have excelled, in no small degree*, in the practice of the most rigid and respectable virtues; and have been the highest honor of their own ages, and the best models for imitation for every succeeding age.' This surely is no measured praise; and yet, that it is from one who was no Calvinist, appears, not only from the above remark on 'the singularity' of the fact, stated by him, but still more, from the following sentence: 'At the same time it must be confessed, that their virtues have in general been rendered unamiable, by a tinge of gloomy and severe austerity.'

Again. 'In Letters addressed to a Serious and Humble Inquirer,' &c., by the Rev. Edward Cooper, Rector of Hampstead Ridgeway, (a distinguished episcopal clergyman of England, and no CALVINIST,) it is thus written: 'Among no denomination or description of professing christians, is there to be found a larger portion of humble, pious, and devoted servants of God, persons of a truly christian spirit, zealous of good works, and exemplary in every duty and relation of life, than among those who hold the Calvinistic tenets. I am sure that your observation and your candor will fully justify this statement. And, therefore, so far as this system is to be judged of by its ACTUAL EFFECTS, I think, that on a candid reconsideration of the subject, you will be induced to abandon your objection, and to admit, that it was founded on an erroneous and partial view of the subject.'

A similar testimony is given by another episcopalian, a lieutenant in the English army. 'Having been led to a belief in these doctrines,'

* See a similar testimony by Abraham Booth, in his Death of Legal Hope, p. 46; in Lorimer, pp. 279, 280, and the very remarkable one given by Dr. Chalmers, in his Address to the inhabitants of Kilmany; in Works, vol. xii. p. 71, &c.

† Sermons, Dublin, 1833, 6th ed. vol. i. pp. 141, 142. See the whole discourse.

he says,* 'now I felt I had power, through Christ strengthening me, to rush into the midst of the battle against the world, the flesh, and the devil, and to give a helping hand to others. Oh! truly they say falsely, who affirm that these are doctrines tending to laxity of moral and spiritual conduct and life; surely they who have felt their power, (and they only can give an opinion,) can testify to the very reverse, and assert that they inspire (under the Spirit's teaching) the christian soldier's heart to begin, and continue to fight the good fight of faith unto death. And why? because he has been assured by the Captain of his salvation, that he shall gain the victory, and come off 'more than conqueror through him that loveth him.'

Such was the influence exerted upon the nation by the prevalence of puritanism. 'During the troubles,' says the Rev. J. Jones, the biographer of bishop Hall, and a minister of the church of England,† 'of the times, on account of the differences between Charles I. and the parliament, puritanism was in one sense productive of much good. *The reformation of manners was then very remarkable.* The laws against vice and profaneness were so strict, and so vigorously put in execution, that vice was forced to hide itself in corners. The magistrates did their duty in suppressing all kinds of games, stage plays, and abuses in public houses. *There was not a play acted on any theatre in England for almost twenty years.* Profane swearing, drunkenness, or any kind of debauchery, were not to be heard or seen on the streets. The Lord's day was observed with unusual reverence. The churches were crowded with numerous and attentive worshippers, three or four times in the day. The peace-officers patrolled the streets of London, and all the public houses were shut up. There was no travelling on the road or walking in the fields, except in cases of absolute necessity. Religious exercises were set up in private families—as reading the Scriptures, family prayer, repeating sermons, and singing of psalms. This was so general a custom, that we are told a person might walk through the city of London, on the evening of the Lord's day, without seeing an idle person, or hearing any thing but the voice of prayer or praise from churches or private houses. *It is also said, that there was hardly a single bankruptcy to be heard of in a year,* and that even in such a case the bankrupt had a mark of infamy set upon him, that he could never wipe off.'

'But in our island,' to add the testimony of Mr. Carlyle.‡ 'there arose a puritanism, which even got itself established as a presbyterianism and national church among the Scotch; which came forth as a real business of the heart; and has produced in the world very notable fruit. In some senses, one may say it is the only phasis of protestantism that ever got to the rank of being a faith, a true heart-communication with Heaven, and of exhibiting itself in history as such.'

When puritanism was put down, and prelacy triumphed, what was the result? 'Sad was the state of religion,' says Mr. Strype, 'at this time;§ the substantials being lost in contending for externals; the

* Church in the Army, p. 151.

† Biography of bishop Hall, pp. 455, 456; in Lorimer, pp. 280, 281. See Burnet's Testim. in Neal, vol. iv. p. 313. As to the Albigenes and Waldenses, see confessions of their enemies, in Fuher's Albigenes, pp. 432, 433.

‡ Lectures on Heroes, p. 231. English ed.

§ Ann. p. 98. Neal's Purit. vol. i. pp. 244, 245. See also, pp. 293, 297, 315, 371, 391. Edinb. Rev. Jan. 1841. In Lorimer, *ibid.* p. 281. Neal, vol. iii. pp. 92, 107, and vol. iv. pp. 16, 53, 313, 320, 321, 335, 347, 360, and vol. v. p. 21. See also Edinb. Rev. July, 1838, p. 267.

churchmen heaped up many benefices upon themselves, and resided upon none, neglecting their cures. Many of them alienated their lands, made unreasonable leases, and waste of woods, and granted reversions and advowsons* to their wives and children.— Among the laity there was little devotion; the Lord's day greatly profaned, and little observed; the common prayers not frequented; some lived without any service of God at all; many were mere heathens and atheists; the Queen's own court a harbor for epicures and atheists, and a kind of lawless place, because it stood in no parish; which things make good men fear some sad judgments impending over the nation.

Toplady confirms this statement.* 'With that prince, (Charles II.) Arminianism returned as a flood, and licentiousness of manners was coextensive with it. We have had since that period more than one hundred years experience of the unsanctified effects which naturally result from the ideal system of free will and universal redemption. What has that system done for us? It has unbraced every nerve of virtue, and relaxed every rein of religious and social duty. In proportion to the operation of its influence, it has gone far toward subverting all moral obedience, and seems to endanger the entire series, even of political and ecclesiastical subordination, &c. Look round the land, and your lordships cannot fail of perceiving that our fiercest free-willers are for the most part the freest livers, and that the belief of universal grace is, in too many instances, the turnpike road to universal sin.'— P. 278. In accordance with these views, Toplady, at a later day, quoted as an illustration of the demoralizing influence of Arminianism, fairly carried out, the case of a zealous advocate of the system, who, 'when he was in fit of intemperance, if any one reminded him of the wrath of God, threatened against such courses, he would answer, 'I am a child of the devil to-day, but I have free will, and to-morrow I will make myself a child of God.'— Works, p. 759.

The Parliamentary Committee on Church Patronage, in 1834, on reporting the result of their labors to the Legislature, remark, 'No sentiment has been so deeply impressed on the mind of your committee, in the course of their long and laborious investigation, as that of veneration and respect for the established church of Scotland. They believe that no institution has ever existed, which, at so little cost, has accomplished so much good. The eminent place which Scotland holds in the scale of nations, is mainly owing to the purity of the standards, and the zeal of the ministers of its church, as well as the wisdom with which its internal institutions have been adapted to the habits and interests of the people.'

Graham, in his History of the United States, gives a similar testimony to the working of the system in New England, after it had been long in operation.† 'Perhaps no country in the world was ever more distinguished than New England at that time, for the general prevalence of those sentiments and habits, that render communities respectable and happy. Sobriety and industry pervaded all classes of the inhabitants. The laws against immorality of every description, were remarkably strict, and not less strictly executed; and being cordially supported by public opinion, they were able to render every vicious and profligate excess equally dangerous and infamous to the perpetra-

* In Lorimer, *ib'id*, p. 281.

† Lorimer, p. 253.

‡ In Lorimer, on the Eldership, p. 155.

tor. There was not a single beggar in the whole province. The general diffusion of education caused national advantages, which were thus vigorously improved, to be justly appreciated, and an ardent and enlightened patriotism knit the hearts of the people to each other and to the country.'

'The effects of puritanism,' says Bancroft,* 'display its true character still more distinctly. Ecclesiastical tyranny is of all kinds the worst; its fruits are cowardice, idleness, ignorance, and poverty. Puritanism was a life-giving spirit; activity, thrift, intelligence, followed in its train; and as for courage, a coward and a puritan never went together. 'He that prays best, and preaches best, will fight best;' such was the judgment of Cromwell, the greatest soldier of his age. . . . The fanatic for Calvinism was a fanatic for liberty; and he defended his creed; for, in the moral warfare for freedom, his creed was a part of his army, and his most faithful ally in the battle.'

If confirmation of these statements be required, we have it in the present relative condition of the principal Protestant and Roman Catholic countries. Compare Italy with Prussia; compare Spain with England; compare Mexico and the South American republics with the United States. Compare Protestant Switzerland, Holland, Scotland, the North of Ireland, the English Nonconformists, the New England States, and our Presbyterian communities here and there scattered through the land—all Calvinistic in their faith—with any other states or communities on earth, where a different form of faith prevails, and their superior morality and intelligence must be apparent. The superiority of the protestant countries is known and read of all men. To what is it owing? Not to physical causes, certainly; for in these the Roman Catholic countries have the advantage.

Villers, a Romanist, in his work on the Reformation, which obtained the prize offered by the National Institute of France, strongly confirms our assertion. After showing that Romanism engenders 'poverty, indolence, immorality, and all sorts of vices,' and the contrary effects of protestantism, he remarks, 'the contrast of these indubitable effects of the two religions is more particularly perceptible in Germany and Switzerland, where the different territories which are intermixed, cause the traveller to pass continually from a Catholic to a Protestant country. Does he meet with a miserable mud cottage, covered with thatch, the fields badly kept, wretched rude peasants, and many beggars: he will be in little danger of erring, if he conjecture that he is in a catholic country. If, on the contrary, neat, pleasant houses are seen, offering the spectacle of affluence and industry, the fields well inclosed, a culture well understood, it is very probable that he is among protestants, anabaptists, or mennonites. Thus nature seems to change her aspect, as he who gives her laws enjoys his liberty more or less, and exercises all his powers in a greater or less degree: while, at the same time, nature appears to have delighted in endeavoring to bestow all her gifts upon the catholic nations which inhabit the finest countries of Europe. This singularity is very evident in the limited territory of Helvetia. Let the fertile plains of Solaire be compared with the much less favored soil of Argovia; the rocky sterile land, unprotected from the northern blasts, of the Pays de Vaud, with the magnificent Italian Switzerland, or the well sheltered Valais; the territory of Neuchatel,

* Hist. of United States, vol. i. pp. 462, 463.

† Lond. 1805, p. 225.

with the fruitful fields of the country lately subjected to the Abbé of Saint Gall; and finally, even in the states of this monk-prince, let that portion which follows the Roman worship be compared with that, much smaller, which, under the protection of Zurich and Berne, has been able to adhere to the reform; and it will every where appear that the activity and knowledge of man is superior to even the liberalities of prodigal nature, while all her benefits are as though they were lost, to idleness and want of care.'

'It is a certain fact,' adds M. Villers,* 'that more crimes are committed in catholic, than in protestant, countries. The author might instance many facts, which he has collected on this subject. He will be satisfied with foreign authorities. Cit. *Rebmann*, president of the special tribunal of Mayenne, in his *Coup-d'œil sur l'état des quatres départemens du Rhin*, says, that the number of malefactors in the catholic and protestant cantons, is in the proportion of four, if not six, to one. At Augsburg, the territory of which offers a mixture of the two religions, of nine hundred and forty-six malefactors, convicted in the course of ten years, there were only one hundred and eighty-four protestants; that is to say, less than one in five. The celebrated philanthropist, *Howard*, observed, that the prisons of Italy were incessantly crowded; at Venice, he has seen three or four hundred prisoners in the principal prison; at Naples, nine hundred and eighty in the succursal prison alone, called *Vicaria*; while he affirms, that the prisons of Berne are almost always empty; that in those of Lausanne he did not find any prisoner; and only three individuals in a state of arrest at Schaffhausen. Here are facts; I do not draw any conclusion.'

Mr. Lorimer has taken great pains to collate the amount of crime in Scotland, as compared with that in England and Ireland. After showing that a large amount of the reported crimes in Scotland are mere misdemeanors, and a large amount committed by Irish Romanists,† he gives the results as follows:‡ 'To prevent Scottish christians, owing to the loose statements which have been made of the unexampled progress of crime in this country, being disheartened in their labors, I may subjoin a comparative view of the state of crime in England and Wales. We have seen that the commitments for crime in Scotland,

In the years 1832,	were 2431,
1836,	" 2922,
1840,	" 3872.

In the same years, the crime of England and Wales was,

In 1832,	20,829 persons committed.
1836,	20,984 " "
1840,	27,187 " "

Now it appears, from the late census, that the population of Scotland is about *one sixth* of that of England and Wales. Were its crime in the same proportion, the Scottish criminals should, at the respective dates, have been 3471, 3497, 4531; instead of which, they were what has been stated; in other words, Scotland had *less* proportional crime

* P. 224. Note.

† See his work on the office of Deacon, Edinb. 1842, pp. 122-132.

‡ Ibid. pp. 132, 133. See also his work on the Eldership, pp. 149-155. Glasg. 1841. See also Sketch of the Presb. Ch. in England, pp. 14 and 41.

than England, by 1040, 575, and 659, in the years referred to; and *that*, though Scotland be a poorer country, and is a stranger to the English poor-law system, which by many is alleged to be a defence against crime, and though, probably, the influx of Irish is proportionally greater into Scotland than into England.

It would scarcely be fair to compare Scotland with Ireland; a protestant with a popish country. I may merely mention the numbers, without expatiating on them. For instance, in Ireland,

In 1832, there were 16,056 commitments.

1836, " 23,891 "

1840, " 23,822 "

Scotland is nearly *one third* of the population of Ireland; were her criminals proportional in numbers, they should have been 5352 and 7963, instead of 2431 and 2922. In other words, Ireland had, *proportionally*, for these years, 2921 and 5041 more criminals than Scotland. But perhaps the most striking fact is, that in 1837, the province of Ulster, the most protestant territory of Ireland, (still one half the population is Roman catholic,) with a population somewhat less than Scotland, had not less than 5605 criminal commitments. In the same year, Scotland had 3126 commitments for crime; in other words, *proportionally*, 2479 fewer criminals than the most prominent part of the sister country!

It is right, however, to state, that, while Ulster suffers in a comparison with Scotland, doubtless from its large Roman catholic population, it gains immensely, on comparison with any other part of Ireland. Thus the one county of Tipperary, in 1837, (population 402,563,) had 4239 crimes, while the whole of the ten counties of Ulster, (population 2,314,104,) had, at the same time, as we have seen, 5605; and while in the Tipperary crimes there were one hundred and twenty-four homicides, many of those of Ulster were comparatively trifling. A few years before, too, the military expense of Ulster was only one twelfth of the general military cost; and of twenty-five regiments in Ireland, only two were stationed in that province, while its population was nearly a third of the whole population of the country.

The practical efficiency of presbyterianism in Ireland is remarkable.* 'What we give,' says the Rev. Mr. Denham of Londonderry, 'to the state in return for our endowment is that sound christian education, which secures the peace and the prosperity of the country, and secures it, too, at an expense vastly less than by any other means hitherto discovered. On examination, it will be found, that the endowment given to the presbyterian church in this country, has been, in place of expenditure, a direct and positive economy. If you take up the expense of the constabulary for the past year, you will find it small in the counties of Ulster in proportion to the number of presbyterians inhabiting those counties. Thus, for instance, in the county of Cavan, where there are few presbyterians, the cost of the constabulary to each inhabitant, is $10\frac{1}{2}$ d., while in Down, the cost to each is only $5\frac{1}{2}$ d. In Termanagh, where there are few presbyterians, the cost to each is $9\frac{3}{4}$ d., while in Derry, it is not $5\frac{1}{4}$ d. Again, comparing the cost on the whole province with that on the other provinces, it would be to each inhabitant of Ulster, $7\frac{3}{4}$ d., and to each in the rest of the kingdom, 1 s. $5\frac{1}{2}$ d., making a saving in Ulster of a sum not less

* Plea for Presbytery, pp. 409, 410.

than £88,833 18s. 10d.* The jail expense to each inhabitant of the rest of the kingdom, is 2½. Thus saving, on the whole inhabitants of Ulster, £7138 16s. 8d., making a saving on those two items of constabulary and jails, of £95,972, 15s. 8d., being nearly three times the amount paid to all the presbyterian clergy in Ireland.

‘The unfortunate persons sentenced to transportation, are sent from all the northern counties to the hulk at Kingstown, previous to embarkation. Out of 3013 who were there in the five years from 1830, only 77 were presbyterians, that is only 1 in every 39. Now each costs the government about £100, or on the whole number £301,300, so that here, by the peculiarly virtuous, and industrious, and peaceable habits of our people, there is another very large sum saved to the nation every year. Allow me here to quote a sentence from a letter transmitted by Lord Normanby, secretary to the colonies, to a commission of the church of Scotland, dated June, 1839: ‘while it was recently found necessary (in New South Wales) to appoint Episcopalian and Roman Catholic chaplains for the jails and penal settlements, it was allowed on all hands, that there was no necessity for the appointment of presbyterian chaplains for these establishments, the number of criminals of this communion in the colony, being quite insignificant.’ In the seven years from 1828, two hundred and fifty-six persons were hung in Ireland, while by a strict examination of all the jails in Ulster, I have discovered that in the twelve years which have now nearly elapsed since 1828, only *four* presbyterians were executed. It were evidently impossible to make any calculation as to what each of these unfortunate persons cost the kingdom, not merely in the retarding of improvement, and preventing the flow of capital into the country, but even in the mere expense of apprehension, imprisonment, judges, queen’s counsel, attornies, executioners, &c. But the sum between the loss and the actual expense, must have been enormous. Yet in this item of expenditure, the presbyterian proportion is so small as scarcely to be named.

‘Thus have I shown, by a reference to facts and figures, that if the government give the presbyterian church a small endowment, it is not necessary for her, in order to make an honest and adequate return, to barter away, or part with one fraction of the liberty wherewith Christ has made her free. She makes to the state an ample return in the form of an immense saving of the public funds secured, and of many and most valuable benefits conferred.’

We may well, therefore, conclude with Budin, the celebrated French writer, though a papist, who affirms that the commonwealth which maintains this discipline, will certainly flourish in virtue and piety.†

* Again, the jail expense to each inhabitant in Ulster, is 1½d.

† In Milton’s Prose Wks. vol. i. p. 132. On the influence of Presbyterianism among the Waldenses, see Dr. Gilly’s Waldensian Researches, pp. 145, 159.

NOTES.

EPISCOPACY AND REPUBLICANISM.—Mr. Bartlett, in his *Memoirs of Bishop Butler*, speaking of his plan for introducing the episcopate into this country, says: (p. 123.) ‘It is much to be regretted, that the deliberations of the government, upon this reasonable and important measure, should have terminated without its adoption. It is said to have been the opinion of that distinguished statesman, Mr. Pitt, that, had the church of England been efficiently established in the United States, it was highly probable, that those States would not have been separated from Great Britain.’ ‘We can easily believe,’ adds the *Churchman’s Monthly Review*, ‘that, if this design had been carried into execution, or if the noble undertaking of Berkeley had not been arrested by Walpole, the United States might, at this day, have been a well-ordered possession of the British crown.’

On the dangerous influence of Romanism, we add the following article from the *N. Y. Observer*, with the remarks of Mr. Durbin:

POWER OF ROMANISM IN THE UNITED STATES.—There is a class of christians and newspapers—very good ones, too, in many respects—who treat all apprehensions of danger to our country and her institutions, from the spread of Romanism, as entirely visionary. They are so firmly persuaded that Americans can never regard the solemn follies of saint-worship, the mass, absolution, &c., otherwise than as ridiculous, that they are ready to smile at the simplicity of those who look upon the growing influence of papacy as an object of dread. Others are quite panic-struck, in view of the open avowal and bold defence of some of the worst features of popery among us.

Our own view of this subject is, perhaps, equally remote from both these extremes. While we would not indulge alarm, we believe there is reason for watchfulness. What the efforts of Roman Catholics have accomplished, in modifying the public schools of New York and Philadelphia, our readers already know. They know, also, that the entering wedge of popish influence will be inserted in every seam and crevice in the foundation of that great protestant republican edifice, which our puritan ancestors reared at such vast expense of toil and suffering. The success of these efforts will be limited only by the want of ability in those who make them. It may be well, then, to inquire, what is the relative ability of Romanism in the United States?

The catholic population of this country is estimated at nearly one million, four hundred thousand, and is, therefore, about one twelfth of the numerical strength of our nation.

Unfortunately, the remaining portion is, and probably will continue to be, divided into two great parties; and these parties are so nearly balanced, that Romanism can decide any question it chooses. How this may be done, will appear from the following facts.

The population of the United States was, in 1840, about seventeen millions. In the presidential election of that year, the whole number of votes cast was two millions four hundred and two thousand five hundred and six; that is, more than every seventh inhabitant was an

actual voter. If the same ratio be extended to the catholic population, it assigns to them two hundred thousand votes. What a tremendous power, if it be but put forth, to decide the balanced elections of our country! The political enthusiasm which animated the successful party, in the election referred to, was great, beyond all precedent, and the majority was the largest ever known in our political history; and yet it was only about one hundred and fifty thousand. It will be seen, then, by comparing this 150,000 majority with the 200,000 votes which Catholics can cast, that Rome may hold the balance of power on any great national question, and still have 50,000 votes to spare!

And we may not flatter ourselves that any important movement takes place here, without its bearings being well considered in the Vatican. Let an emergency arise, in which his Holiness at Rome shall think it worth his while to interfere, and swift as a telegraphic despatch an unseen signal will be made across the ocean, and repeated over our land; and all factions and subdivisions among Romanists in America will be merged, and the whole mass, under their spiritual leaders, will come up to the polls in a solid phalanx. The great party chieftains—whose trade is politics—who live and move and have their being for objects of selfish ambition—will not be slow to perceive and to conciliate this papal influence. For the sake of its vote, *en masse*, they will give it—not at once, but little by little—the stand-points it demands; and when it gains these, *then* it will throw off the mask, and hold up its proud front, and ask no favors.

It is in this way that we fear Romanism will grow into a dangerous element in our republic. And the obvious defence of our country is, not in the nature of the government, the present intelligence of the people, or the patriotism of political men—but in the life and activity of our Protestant churches; in the zeal of our light-bearing institutions of benevolence—the Bible, Tract, Sunday School, and Missionary Societies; in the prayers of the pious; and above all, and *through* all these, in the energy of that Holy Spirit, who is able to bring communities, as well as individuals, to know the truth as it is in Jesus.

REPUBLICANS BE WARNED.—Mr. Durbin, the eminent Methodist minister, now in England, writes thus to the editor of the *Christian Advocate*:—‘This question of Apostolic Succession involves much more than the conflict between the ‘Established Church’ and the interests of dissent in any and every form. My travels on the continent, and my observations and inquiries in England, fully satisfy me, that there is a close connection between this claim of divine exclusive apostolic succession, and the claim of monarchs to rule, *jure divino*, to be ‘kings by the grace of God.’ For, beyond all question, the principle of the hierarchy has a very warm sympathy with monarchy; and this fact has been well expressed by ‘no bishop, no king.’ Hierarchy and monarchy are about to make common cause in Europe, and then, if successful, the match is to be applied to the explosive elements collecting in America, in the form of foreigners, adopting our country, but retaining their European principles, and in the form of ‘apostolical succession,’ by which men propose to claim the exclusive right to administer the sacraments of the church. The principles of these two sympathetic powers are the same; the one claims to rule the church by a divine right, and the other to rule the people *jure divino*. They have learned wisdom by experience, and neither will claim to be supreme, but agree to be coördinate and concurrent, and to rule mankind as their common patrimony.’

I N D E X .

A.

Adams, Hon. John Quincy, 24.
 Aiton, Dr. Life of Henderson, 55,
 119, &c.
 Anderson's Defence of Presbyterian-
 ism, 252.
 Arnold, Dr. 51.
 Allsop's *Melius Inquirendum*, 36.
 Archer, Mr. 27.
 Arminianism associated with arbi-
 trary power, 175, 176.
 Armstrong, Rev. C. E. 199.
 Arnold of Brescia, account of, 105.

B.

Baird's visit to Northern Europe,
 113.
 Baltimore Lit. and Relig. Magazine,
 66, 222.
 Bancroft's Hist. of the United States,
 57, 59, 72.
 Bastwick's Utter Routing, 232, 247.
 Baxter on Episcopacy, 17.
 Baxter's Disputations on Church
 Govt. 36, 73, 227, &c.
 Bellarmine, 152.
 Biblical Repertory, 102.
 Bigotry explained, 205.
 Bisset's Sketch of Democracy, 25.
 Blackburn's Intermediate State, 133.
 Blair's *Waldenses*, 242, &c.
 Blondel, 242.
 Bolingbroke's Idea of a Patriot King,
 129.
 Breckinridge and Hughes's Discus-
 sion, 56, 58, 62, 86, &c.
 Brooke, Lord, on Episcopacy, 17,
 18, 255.
 Brooke's Hist. of Religious Liberty,
 16, 108, 109.
 Brougham's Political Philosophy, 23,
 24, 26, 69, 78.

Brown's Vindication of Presbyte-
 rian Ch. Govt. 55, 80.
 Brownlee, Dr. 182.
 Brydges, Sir Egerton, 115.
 Buchanan, 120.
 Bull, Bishop, 291, &c.
 Burgess, Bishop, Tracts, 258.
 Burnet's Hist. of Ref. 137.

C.

Calvinism, republican, 54, &c. 175.
 Calvin, taught the independence of
 the Church from the State, 95,
 124, a republican, 115.
 Campbell's Vind. of the Presb. Ch.
 in Ireland, 17.
 Candlish, Dr. 240, 249.
 Cardwell's Documentary Annals,
 134.
 Carne, McAlexander, quoted, 19.
 Carlyle's Lectures on Heroes, 108,
 112, 119, &c.
 Catholicity of Presbytery, 271, &c.
 Chandler, Dr. Appeal, 153.
 Chandler, Dr. 249.
 Chalmers's Biographical Dict. 120.
 Chalmers, Dr. 125, 252.
 Charleston Courier, The, 29.
 Charleston Gospel Messenger, 202.
 Charlotte Elizabeth, 158.
 Christian Advocate, The, 148.
 Christian Advocate, Southern, 148,
 &c.
 Christianity Indep. of the Civil Govt.
 The, quoted, 16, 25.
 Christianity not identified with any
 form of civil government, 13, 15, &c.
 Christianity independent of the civil
 polity, 14, 15.
 Christianity, its doctrines, republican,
 38, &c.
 Christianity, its institutions repub-
 lican, 43.

Christian Register, *The*, 163.
 Church, *The*, liberality of the presbyterian doctrine concerning, 239.
 Church, *The* Christian, republican, 38, &c.
 Church and State, presbyterians secured the separation of, in this country, 194, &c.
 Churchman's *The*, Monthly Review, 74, 157, 255.
 Civil government not identified with Christianity, 13, 15, &c.
 Claude's Defence of the Reformation, 66, 70, 73, &c.
 Clinton, *The* Hon. Mr. 50.
 Coleridge's Church and State, 255.
 Coleridge's Aids to Reflection, 268.
 Collier's Eccles. Hist. 180.
 Colton's Reasons, 255.
 Conder's Analytic View of all Relig. 67.
 Confession of Faith, 15.
 Constitution, *The*, and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Ch. by Dr. Hawks, 158, &c.
 Cooper, Rev. Edward, 313.
 Corbet's Remains, 244.
 Cotton's Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, 53.
 Crabbe's Synonymes, 214.
 Cramp's Text Book of Popery, 181, 261.
 Creeds, republicanism of, 88.
 Culdees, *The*, republican, 104.
 Cummings's Apology for the Ch. of Scotl. 291, 292.

D.

D'Aubigne's Hist. of the Ref. 113.
 Dalcho's Hist. of Prot. Ep. Ch. in S. C. 156.
 Degerando, Baron, 213.
 Dryden, 120, 137.
 Duffield's Letters, 162.
 Duncan, Dr. 209.

E.

Ecclesiastical polity, influence of on civil, 20, 21.
 Eclectic Review, 118.
 Edinburgh Review, 124, 128, 211.
 Efficiency of presbyterianism in securing morality and preventing crime, 311.
 Emmons's Wks. Dr. 208.
 Encyclopedia Britannica, 312.
 England, republicanism in, history of, 127.

England, reformation of, not popular, 128.
 England, Bishop, his anti-republicanism, 193, 194.
 Episcopal Church, *The* Protestant, less republican than the presbyterian, 153.
 Episcopacy and monarchy, essentially related, 154.
 Faber on the Reformation, 174.
 Firmin's Separation Examined, 244.
 Forms and formality, republicanism opposed to, 91.
 Foreign Conspiracy against the United States, 20, 188.
 Fulke, 291.

G.

Geneva, its republicanism, 113.
 Gillespie's Aaron's Rod Blossoming, 55, 138.
 Godwin's History of the Commonwealth, 131.
 Graham's Hist. of the United States, 315.
 Guizot's Hist. of Civilization, 131.
 Guthrie's Causes of God's Wrath, 121.

H.

Hamilton on Missions, 286.
 Hamilton, *The* Papers, 25.
 Hanbury's Memorials, 138.
 Hawks's Constitution and Canons of Prot. Epis. Ch. 171, &c.
 Henry, Mathew, his liberality, 247.
 Herschel's Letter to Sibthorp, 279.
 Hewett's Hist. of S. Carolina, 62.
 High Church Prelacy anti-republican, 173, &c.
 History of Switzerland, 114.
 History of the Covenanters, 126, 243.
 History, *The*, of the English and Scotch Presbytery, 136.
 Hodge, Dr. History of the Presbyterian Church, 54, 124, 139, 291.
 Hoffman's Anglo-Prussian Bishopric, 179.
 Horsley, 115.
 Howe, his liberality, 247.
 How's Vindication of the Prot. Ep. Ch. 202, 218, &c.
 Hooker's Eccl. Polity, 78.
 Huber, 179.
 Hughes, Bishop, 86, 187.
 Huss, a republican, 106, 107.

I.

- Ibbot, Dr. Boyle's Lectures, 204.
 Indifference, the doctrine of exposed, 206.
 Ireland, efficiency of presbytery in preventing crime in, 318.
 Irving, Edward, 120, 126, 252.

J.

- Jahn's Hebrew Commonwealth, 31, 32.
 Jahn's Archæology, 32, 33.
 James King, his writings quoted, 121.
 Jameson's Fundamentals of the Hierarchy, 17.
 Jameson's Cyprianus Isotimus, 77, 111.
 Jefferson's Works, 27.
 Jones, Rev. J. 313.
 Jones, Rev. William, 81.
 Junkin, Dr. Inaugural Address, 89.
 Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici, 241.
 Jus Divinum Regiminis Ecclesiastici, 241.
 Justification by faith, influence of in the promotion of freedom, 56, &c.
 Jus Populi, 121.

K.

- Keble on Tradition, 50.
 Kent's Commentaries, 29, 79, 83, 85, 86.
 Knox a republican, in spirit, 119.

L.

- Lamy's Biblical Apparatus, 33.
 Lancey, Dr. Bishop, 169, 170.
 Lang, Dr. Religion and Education in America, 53, 96, 97, &c.
 Laud, Archbishop, on the Liturgy and Episc. 136.
 Lathbury's History of the English Episcopacy, 67.
 Latitudinarianism exposed, 206.
 Lectures on the Headship of Christ, 16, 67, 86, 124.
 Liberality, the nature of explained, 203, &c.
 Locke on Government, 24, 25, 27, 33, 84, 85, &c.
 London Tablet, The, 158.
 London Quarterly Review, 68, 164, 253.
 Lorimer's Manual of Presbytery, 17, 86, 233.
 Loyalty of Presbyterians, 16, 17.

M.

- Macaulay's Miscellanies, 129, &c.
 Mackenzie's Hist. of the Christ. Ch. 125.
 Mackintosh's Hist. of England, 50, 58.
 Maurice's Kingdom of Christ, 125.
 McCrie, Dr. Life of Knox, 110.
 McCrie, Dr. Life of Melville, 20, 21, 55, 134.
 McCrie, on the Unity of the Church, 63.
 McLeod, Rev. John, 141.
 McLeod, Dr. 249.
 Melville, his republican character, and writings, 125.
 Mennais, Abbé de la, 209.
 Methodist Episcopal Church, less republican than the Presbyterian, 145.
 Michaelis, 33, 34.
 Milman's Hist. of Christianity, 36.
 Milner's Life of Watts, 138.
 Miller, Dr. on the Ministry, 55.
 Miller, Dr. Life of Dr. Rogers, 144, 155.
 Milton's Prose Wks. 17, 72, 93, 198, &c.
 Minorities protected by presbyterianism, 88.
 Mitchell's Letters to Bishop Skinner, 252.
 Montesquieu's Spirit of Laws, 23.
 Muir, Dr. quoted, 81, 243.

N.

- Naphtali, 121.
 Neal's History of the Puritans, 54, 138.
 Neander's History of the Planting of Christianity, 36, 49.
 Newman on Romanism and Dissent, 291.
 Nichols, Dr. 180.
 Nolan's Catholic Character of Christianity, 173, 174.
 Notes of the Church Examined, 216.

O.

- Ordination, the presbyterian doctrine of, republican, 73, &c. and liberal, 227, &c.
 Our Liberties Defended, 188.
 Owen, Dr. 54.
 Oxford Tracts, 205, 255.

P.

- Paget's Def. of Presb. Ch. Govt. 76, 232.

- Palmer on the Church, 209.
 Parliamentary Committee on the efficiency of presbytery, 314.
 Pascal's Thoughts, 25.
 Patrick Welwood, 126.
 Paul, Father, Hist. of Benefices, 36.
 Perceval's Roman Schism, 261.
 Pictorial History of England, 108.
 Popery, on the anti-republicanism of, 181, &c.; illiberality of, 257; anathematizing spirit of, 261; not catholic, 281.
 Powell, Professor, of Oxford, 238.
 Predestination, influence of on freedom, 50, 60.
 Prelacy and monarchy essentially connected, 156; Romish and Anglican, the illiberality of, 254, &c.; indifferent to truth and bigoted as to forms, 255; not catholic, 281.
 Prelates, opposition to in America, 155.
 Presbytery, the term defined, 13; what denominations are included under it, 13, 52, 53; republican in its doctrines, 54, 175, &c.; neither a monarchy, nor an aristocracy, 61; republican in its principles, 65; in its doctrine of the ministry, 67; and ruling elders, 75; in its ecclesiastical judicatories, 79; in its history, ch. iii.; more republican than other forms of polity, ch. iv.; catholicity of, 271, &c.
 Presbyterian Church, liberality of, 215; not persecuting, 231; both liberal and orthodox, 239.
 Presbyterian Review, The, 108, 124, 252.
 Presbyterianism Defended, quoted, 55.
 Preston, The Hon. Mr. 28.
 Price, Dr. Hist. of Protestant Non-conf. 63, 132, 136, 175, &c.
 Pridham's Church Reform, 302.
 Pritchard's Researches, 32.
 Prynne's Lordly English Prelacy, 17.
 Pulpit, power of the, in promoting freedom, 55.
 Puritans, The, their republicanism, 128, 129, &c.
 Pusey, Dr. 293.
- Q.
- Questions and Answers on the Methodist Protestant Church, 19.
- R.
- Reformation, The, the development of republicanism, 108.
- Reid, Dr. Hist. of Presb. Ch. in Ireland, 138.
 Reed, Mr. William B. 143, 146.
 Republic defined, 23, 24.
 Republicanism, the principles of, 23, &c.
 Rice, Dr. Illustrations of the Char. and Cond. of the Presb. Ch. 103.
 Rice, Dr. Evang. Magazine, 61.
 Rice, Dr. Considerations on Relig. 142.
 Riddle's Christian Antiquities, 49.
 Riddle's Eccles. Chronology, 35.
 Rogers's Life of Howe, 138.
 Romish Church, The, not Catholic, 281.
 Ruling Elders, The office of, republican, 75, &c.
 Rutherford's Lex Rex, 121.
 Rutherford's Plea, 138.
- S.
- Sacraments, liberality of the presbyterian doctrine on, 224, &c.
 Schism, by Dr. Hoppus, 242.
 Scott, Rev. Thomas, 133.
 Scott's Continuation of Milner, 113.
 Scottish Christian Herald, 55.
 Scotland, republican party and spirit in, 125, 126; efficiency of presbytery in, 318, &c.
 Secker, Archbishop, 154.
 Second Book of Discipline, The, 15.
 Shakspeare, 257.
 Shield's Hind Let Loose, 121.
 Soames's Elizab. Rel. Hist. 138.
 South's Sermons, 180.
 Southey's Book of the Church, 180.
 Spring, Dr. Obligations of the World to the Bible, 34, 50, 51.
 Strype, 136.
 Swift, Dean, Sermons, 136.
 Sydney, Algernon, 26, 31, 33, 147.
 Syon's Royal Prerogative, 22.
- T.
- Taylor's Ancient Christianity, 169.
 Taylor, Isaac, Spiritual Despotism, 138.
 Taylor, Isaac, Pref. to Life of Luther, 57.
 Taylor, Dr. Biog. of the Age of Elizabeth, 117, 133.
 The Case of the Accommodation Examined, 161.
 The Church in the Army, 313.
 Tocqueville's Democracy in America, 19, 22, 23, 25, 29, 30, 75, &c.
 Toplady, 311, 314.
 Turretine, 242.

- U.
 United States, the republicanism of
 owing greatly to presbyterians,
 138, &c.
 Universal suffrage, found in presby-
 terianism, 88.
- V.
 Vail's Comprehensive Church, 19.
 Vaughan's Life of Wickliffe, 105.
 Vaughan's, Dr. Congregationalism,
 25, 54.
 Villers on the Reformation, 25, 67,
 92, &c.
 Virginia, Synod of, their resolutions
 on liberality, 220, &c.
- W.
 Waddington's Church History, 36.
 Webster, Hon. Daniel, 50.
 Welles, Rev. Noah, liberality of, 248.
 Whateley. Archbishop, Charges and
 Tracts, 208.
 Whateley's Bampton Lectures, 208,
 211.
 Whateley's Christianity Independ.
 of the Civil Power, 208.
 Whateley's Kingdom of Christ, 211.
 White, Rev. Hugh, 312.
 White, Bishop, 19, 36, 90, 155.
 Whitgift, Archbishop, 159.
 Wickliffe, a republican, 106, 107.
 Wilson, Dr. Mem. of Bishop White,
 155.
 Wilson, Bishop, Sacra Privata, 164.
 Wilson's Hist. Inq. concerning the
 English Presbyterians, 245.
 Woodgate's Bampton Lect. 138, 179
 Wragg's Poem on 'The Deity,'
 211.



THE
PRELITICAL DOCTRINE
OF
APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION
EXAMINED,

AND THE PROTESTANT MINISTRY DEFENDED AGAINST THE
ASSUMPTIONS OF POPERY AND HIGH CHURCHISM,

In a Series of Lectures.

BY THOMAS SMYTH,
Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Charleston, S. C.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Overture adopted by the Synod of S. Carolina and Geo. at its session in 1841.

That the publication of works intended to advocate the distinctive order and polity of our church should be encouraged, and their circulation among our people rendered as general as possible; and it having come to the knowledge of this Synod, that one of their number, the Rev. Thomas Smyth, of Charleston, has recently given to the Church, among other valuable publications, 'An Ecclesiastical Catechism of the Presbyterian Church, for the use of Families, Bible Classes, and Private Members,'—and a series of lectures on 'The Prelitical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession Examined, and the Protestant Ministry Defended against the Assumptions of Popery and High-Churchism.' Therefore, *Resolved*, That the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia regard with pleasure and approbation these publications, as containing an able defence of the divine authority of the Protestant Ministry, and a full and satisfactory exposition of the order and government of our Church; and as demanded by the present state of the controversy on these subjects. And the Synod does, therefore, cordially recommend the said publications to all our Ministers, Elders, and private members, as works of high value, and calculated to advance the intelligence of our Church, on our distinctive peculiarities and doctrines.

Extract from a review of the work in the Biblical Repository, for Jan'y, 1841.

'This book does no small credit to the industry and talent of the author. The importance of his subject, the correctness of his views, and the abundance of materials which he seems to have had at his command, entitle his performance to the most respectful notice. The author's mind is not only strong but lively, and his book exhibits traces of both qualities. The natural, (and may we not say,) national, vivacity with which he seizes on his topics and discusses them, enlivens in a very satisfactory degree even those parts of the subject which might otherwise have proved most irksome and fatiguing. In a word, the book, (which by the way is elegantly printed,) may be freely commended to the favorable notice of the public; and we doubt not that wherever it is read it will be useful, in apprising those who read it what the high church doctrine really is, and on what grounds it may be most triumphantly and easily refuted.'

From the Southern Christian Advocate.

'We have the pleasure to announce the probable publication of these Lectures at no distant day. As far as opportunity has allowed it, we have attended Mr. Smyth's course, and been both pleased and edified. Pleased, in witnessing a fine combination of candor, kindness, and strength, in the discussion of difficult and soul-rousing questions. Edified, in listening to a vigorous discussion of important first principles, where the lecturer was master of his thesis, and backed his reasoning by extensive authority of the highest value in this controversy. This volume, in which the Prelatic Doctrine of Apostolical Succession is considered, will be highly valuable to the theological student.'

From the Christian Intelligencer, of the Reformed Dutch Church, N. Y.

'This is an exceedingly neat volume of five hundred and sixty-eight pages, beautiful in its mechanical execution, and upon a subject of grave and exciting importance. The work is seasonable, and from the cursory examination which we have as yet been able to give to it, we believe that it will prove to be exceedingly valuable. The work before us, at the present crisis, is seasonable and necessary. It is more ample in its discussion than any that preceded it. It is the result of much and patient research, and will be found to reflect credit alike upon the talents and learning, and we will add also, the temper of the author. He has rendered the Protestant community a debtor. We desire that the work may have the widest circulation, and receive the careful perusal both of Episcopalians and Christians of every other name.'

From the Christian Advocate and Journal, of the Methodist Church, N. Y.

'This is a large octavo volume. The author makes thorough work of his subject, examining the pretensions of Prelacy with care and candor, and exposing their fallacy with unanswerable force and perspicuity. He gives the claims which are set up by Popery and High-Churchmen in their own language, and refutes them by arguments drawn from reason, church history, and Scripture. The Christian world seems to be waked up anew to the high and exclusive claims of Prelacy by the astounding assumptions of the Oxford divines; and we admit that such a book as that before us seems to be called for by the occasion, and will no doubt be read with great interest.'

From the New York Evangelist.

'A large and elegant octavo volume, on a most important topic. Its object is the examination of the claims of the Popish hierarchy, and of that portion of the clergy and laity of the Episcopal Church which sympathizes with them, to the exclusive right to the functions and privileges of the Christian ministry and Church. These claims, always unscriptural, have of late assumed new arrogance and vigor, by the brief currency of the Oxford publications, and the greatly quickened zeal of the Papacy among us. The time has certainly arrived when their exclusive notions should be subjected to the searching test of reason and scripture. If there are those among us who will vauntingly assume that theirs is the only, the valid ministry, that with them are to be found the only authorized ordinances of salvation, that there is no safety but within the pale of their own denomination; let their pretensions be sifted, and the emptiness of their claims be exposed by the clear light of truth. That such a contest with the principle of Prelacy is yet to be waged, and that it is to be abandoned, there can be no doubt. We hail every effort to throw light upon the subject. Mr. Smyth has entered vigorously upon the field of controversy, and has spared neither pains or strength to do it justice. He has gone over the whole ground in a more extended manner than any writer before him in this country, and in an able manner.'

From The Presbyterian.

'The volume before us contains a very full and minute discussion of the doctrine indicated in its title, and is to be followed by another which will vindicate the claims of Presbyterianism. The necessity of the work arises from the

increasing boldness and arrogance with which the Episcopal Church obtrudes its claims as the only true church, with the only valid ordinances, and the only divinely constituted ministry. As to the manner in which he has accomplished his task, we are disposed to judge very favorably, from the necessarily partial manner in which we have been able to examine his work. He has acquired a clear and distinct view of the question discussed in all its bearings, and to each specific point he has brought a mind stored with the fruits of extensive reading. We have admired the extent of his research, and his diligence in learning all that had been said by preceding writers which could throw light on the discussion; and indeed we have rather regarded him as too redundant in his authorities; a fault, by the way, not often committed in this age of jumping at conclusions. Mr. Smyth states the question of Apostolic succession, so much in the mouth of modern Episcopalians, and he views it in all possible lights, weighs it in just balances, and pronounces it wanting. He not only proves that the assumption is unscriptural and unreasonable, but he traces the boasted succession, and shows its broken links, and finds after all the flourish of trumpets, that prelatists are glorying in a mere shadow. He carries the war, moreover, into the enemy's camp, and he carries off many trophies. Mr. Smyth is undoubtedly an able controversialist, and prelatists will find him well armed at all points, if they are disposed to attack.'

From the Southern Christian Advocate.

'The work before us is, we believe, the first distinct treatise published in this country on the subject of the Apostolical Succession, and in opposition to its arrogant assumptions. A very ably argued and well written work has been recently given to the English public, entitled 'An Essay on Apostolical Succession,' by the Rev. Thomas Powell, a Wesleyan minister, of which Mr. Smyth makes honorable mention. We consider, therefore, the publication of these Lectures as a valuable contribution to the religious literature of the time, demanded withal by the claims of that portion of our common Christianity, which is so unfortunate as to have no participation in the anointing oil of prelatistical consecration, and which lies beyond the range of apostolico-succession-covenant blessing. Mr. Smyth has executed his task in a candid, kind, and courteous spirit, while he has subjected the theory of Apostolical Succession to the scrutiny of a thorough, extensive, and fearless examination. Innumerable authorities are cited, and a copious index concludes the volume, which embraces upwards of five hundred and sixty-nine pages, and is gotten up in the finest finish of the typographical art.'

From the Charleston Observer.

'Notice was taken of these Lectures while in course of delivery. They are now published, and with the notes, which contain as much reading as the text, make a large volume of five hundred and sixty-eight pages. The typographical execution is in the best modern style, from the press of Crocker and Brewster, Boston. Our design, at present, is simply to apprise our readers that the work is published, intending at our leisure to give it a more formal notice. As the basis of the opinion controverted, rests upon what is familiarly known as the Apostolical Succession, it is here that the author has exhibited his chief strength. And were we to say that he has made good his position, it might be regarded as only a judgment expressed in accordance with previously existing prejudices in its favor. But we hope, on the other hand, that none will undertake to condemn it unread. The advocates of High-Churchism, whether Roman or Anglican, are chiefly concerned in the discussion, and possibly they may find in the work something that will moderate their exclusive zeal, and lead them to the exercise of more charity for the opinions of those from whom they differ.'

From The Presbyterian.

'MR. EDITOR:—I ask room in your paper to commend this work to the attention of the ministers and intelligent laymen of our Church. If there be any among them who doubt whether a work of this sort was called for, their doubts will not survive the reading of the first Lecture, entitled 'The Necessity for an Exam-

ination into the Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession.' The discussion, therefore, in which Mr. Smyth has embarked, was provoked by the growing disposition among High-Church Episcopalians, to unchurch the Presbyterian body, and challenge exclusive salvation to the members of churches under Diocesan Bishops. His work is not an attack, but a defence—a defence conducted with great ability and skill. I venture to commend it to the notice of your readers, because I am satisfied they will be instructed and profited by the perusal of it. The lectures are evidently the result of much study, and very extensive research. No single volume I have seen, contains such a mass of authorities and seasonable testimonies, on the Prelatical controversy as this work. It is equally creditable to the author's talents and industry, that he should have found time to prepare, in the midst of his pastoral duties, an octavo of five hundred and fifty pages, on a subject requiring so much study, and involving an examination of several hundred distinct works on either side of the controversy. Such labors ought not to go unrequited; but his brethren will be rendering themselves and the cause of truth a substantial service, by placing it in their libraries; and it is for this reason that their attention is invited to it by one who has no other concern in it than that which is common to every Presbyterian.'

From the New York Observer.

'A formidable volume this is in appearance, and on this very account will repel many who might otherwise be attracted to examine its pages. In a course of twenty-one lectures the author has, with great industry and research, and no mean ability as a controversialist, examined the question before him, and presented, in the compass of a single book, a mass of testimony that must be of value to those whose time and means will not allow them to pursue the investigation through all the original sources, which Mr. Smyth has so perseveringly explored.'

From the Watchman of the South.

'We offer a few general remarks at present, intending at an early day to notice them, or at least that last named, far more fully than we usually do. One thing must strike every one who knows the history of the author of these works. We refer to his industry. Without very firm bodily health, and having a very laborious pastoral charge, he still economizes time sufficient to bring out, through the press, from time to time, important contributions to the cause he loves. This is as it should be. Mr. Smyth is, of course, a *growing* minister. His influence and usefulness are constantly extending. It is also obvious to any one who reads Mr. Smyth's works, that he has, or has the use of a very good library, and is a man of no mean learning. His works show the importance of ministers' salaries being such as to enable them to 'give themselves to reading.' But Mr. Smyth is not a mere reader. He arranges and uses what he reads. His character as a writer rises every year. Mr. Smyth is also ardently attached to Presbyterianism. Further remarks may be expected in a week or two.'

From the Charleston Courier.

'We would call the attention of all those who profess any regard for the literary character of our southern community, to a work recently published by our esteemed fellow-townsmen, the Rev. Thomas Smyth, entitled 'Lectures on the Apostolical Succession.' Whatever may be the opinion of the intelligent reader on the subjects of which it treats, he will acknowledge it to be a striking example of extensive and profound research, and most diligent investigation. The author appears to have enjoyed some remarkable advantages in the prosecution of his inquiries. Possessing, as he does, one of the best private libraries in this country—probably the most complete in the theological department—he has had access to an immense mass of authorities, not usually within the reach of the American scholar, and his abundant and voluminous references make his book an absolute index for the use of future writers. His industry, indeed, has left but scanty gleanings, as it would appear, for any who may desire to follow him in this discussion. His style is easy and animated, and the interest of the reader is kept up, without flagging, through an octavo of nearly six hundred

pages. We hope the success of this highly creditable effort may be such as to induce the learned and reverend author to complete his task, by giving promptly to the public the second volume of his course, promised in his preface.

From the Christian Observer.

'From a cursory examination of this work, we think it well adapted to accomplish the good purposes for which it is designed. It exposes and refutes the extravagant assumptions of High-Churchmen, who claim to be the successors of the apostles in the ministry, exclusive of all those who reject their views of Prelacy. The work is worthy of a more extended notice, which shall be given at an early day.'

From the Christian Watchman. (Boston—a Baptist paper.)

'This volume has lain on our table a considerable time, to enable us to give it such an examination as the subject and the merits of the book demand. The discussion throughout is conducted with candor, impartiality, and kindness; and displays no small share of ability, learning, and diligent research. It is decidedly the most able and thorough vindication of the Presbyterian view of the subject which we have ever seen. The discussion, too, is timely, when Episcopal popery is receiving a new impulse from the Oxford writers, whose sentiments find so much sympathy even in our own land. We commend the book, therefore, to the attention of our brethren in the ministry, not as taking in every instance that ground which we, as Baptists and Independents should prefer to see taken, but as an able defence of the truth, and an extensive collection of authorities and facts.'

From the Christian Examiner and General Review, (Boston,) Nov. 1841.

'We by no means intend to intimate that the work is ill-timed or superfluous. Such is not our opinion. We believe it will do good. It will meet the new phase of the controversy, and supply what we have no doubt is, in some parts of our country, a pressing want. Even the greatest absurdities, iterated and reiterated in a tone of unblushing confidence, will gain some adherents. Besides, the old treatises on the subject are in a manner inaccessible to the general reader, and will produce a deeper impression, even if it be not more applicable, which in ordinary cases it will be, to the state of the times. The present volume we regard as not only suited to the times, but in itself a production of no trifling merit. It indicates great industry, and no little research on the part of the writer, and its statements appear, from such an examination as we have been able to give it, entitled to confidence. . . . There is an earnestness, good temper and thoroughness which mark the work, which we like, and we can very cordially commend it to the attention of all who feel an interest in the subject.'

From the Southern Quarterly Review.

'This is one of the ablest works of theological controversy, that has appeared during the present century, and we are happy to be able to add that it is the production of a Charleston clergyman. . . . We say then, in the outset, that the Presbyterian church has, in our opinion, in the author of the work before us, a powerful champion, who wields a polished pen, and one who seems to be eminently fitted, by his learning, his talents, and his industry, to maintain manfully the cause he has espoused. We have read his book with deep interest, and with great respect for his ability, and the general candor and fairness of his arguments.' [April, 1843: pp 534—537.]

From the Magnolia, a Literary Magazine and Monthly Review.

'The Doctrine of Apostolical Succession is here examined in an elaborate course of Lectures, twenty-one in number, by the Rev. Thos. Smyth, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Charleston. It is not within our province to examine them. We can say nothing, therefore, of the question which Mr. Smyth discusses. No doubt he discusses it ably. He certainly discusses it ear-

nestly. He is ingenious and forcible, and displays a wonderful deal of industry and research. Here now is an octavo of near six hundred pages, brimful of study, and crowded with authorities. We perceive that Mr. Smyth wins the plaudit 'well done,' from numerous high sources, advocating the same doctrine with himself. They seem to think that his argument has done ample justice to his subject; and we may add, so far as we have been able to examine it, that it has been urged in a candid and Christian temper.'

From —, Attorney General in the State of —.

'Your Lectures I read with the highest satisfaction, and take great pleasure in acknowledging the obligations which I think the friends of Christian truth, religious liberty, and I will add, of the pure undefiled gospel, owe to you for them. Your vindication of the Church, by which I mean the humble followers of our Lord, by whatever name called, from the claims of usurped ecclesiastical domination, seems to me to be complete; and whilst you have, in succession, destroyed and dissipated every ground of doubt on the subject, in the minds of the unprejudiced, your extensive and enlightened research and discrimination, have enabled you to furnish an armory, where every one may supply himself with weapons for defence against individual attack. Nor am I less gratified with the candid and charitable tone and temper with which your views are propounded, than with the overwhelming mass of argument and illustration by which they are demonstrated. Your lectures seem to me to have been written in a truly Christian spirit; and if they have been cavilled at on that ground, it can only be because men always feel attacks upon their prejudices to be unkind.'

From the New England Puritan.

'This large octavo, of five hundred and sixty-eight pages, is a highly seasonable offering to the Protestant Churches of our country, and displays an amount of learning, of research, of skill and power in argument, of fertility in illustration, of combined candor and earnestness of spirit, rarely to be met with in any volume either of home or foreign origin. We have not had it in hand long enough to master the whole of its contents—but long enough to be satisfied of its happy adaptation to the sad times on which we have fallen, and of the richness of the treasures it offers to the acceptance of the true friends of Christ. The volume before us, though perfectly calm and candid in its discussions, leaves this matter plain as sunlight. More formidable foes to Christ and his apostles are not to be found amid all the tribes of religious errorists, than those arrayed beneath the banners of Popery and High Churchism. It is to be hoped that our brethren in the ministry will avail themselves of the labors of Mr. Smyth, to become thoroughly acquainted with this imposing form of error, and arm themselves with 'panoply divine' to meet it and confound it, ere it attains the preëminence to which it aspires, and which, unresisted, it will inevitably attain.'

From the Boston Recorder.

'This is truly an elaborate work. Our attention has been but recently called, in a special manner, to its contents, but our highest expectations of the candor and ability of the discussion have been more than satisfied. The object of the author's animadversion is not episcopacy, as such; but the arrogant and exclusive claim of High Churchmen and Romanists to be the *only* true Church of Christ; his *only* real ministers, and the 'only sources of efficacious ordinances and covenanted salvation.' The volume is eminently appropriate to the times, and, if read with a sincere desire for the truth, must, we think, prove an immediate corrective of any tendencies towards the Church of England or of Rome.'

From the Christian World, by the Rev. Mr. Stockton, of the Protestant Methodist Church.

'The Lectures which have led us to these remarks, are a valuable addition to religious literature, and more particularly, the polemical department of it. They number twenty-one, and fill a handsome volume of five hundred and fifty pages. The chief aim of the author has been to test the prelatical doctrine by Scripture,

history, and facts—to exhibit its popish, intolerant, unreasonable, and suicidal character, and to show that it has been condemned by the best authorities. The latter part of the work is devoted to a consideration of Schism, and to a discussion of the true doctrine of Apostolical Succession. The plan covers the whole subject—the execution is well managed. It is bold, but temperate—fearless, but not reckless—a fine specimen of good tactics in a defensive war. As a textbook it is worthy of high commendation, abounding as it does in copious extracts, and presenting the views of all our standard authors. It is a focal point where many rays have been gathered—we had almost said at the risk of good taste—a hive, where many bees had deposited honey. If it be not as eloquent as Mason's *Essay* on this subject, or as cogent and imaginative as Milton's *Tracts* on it, we have no hesitation in preferring it to either, for compass, variety, and clear demonstration.'

From the American Biblical Repository.

'This well filled octavo volume has come into our hands. Its leading subjects, as indicated in the title-page, are of sufficient importance to demand a thorough discussion; and we agree with our author in the belief that the time has come when such a discussion is necessary for the proper vindication of the rights and duties of the great body of the Protestant ministry and churches, against the assumptions of a portion of their own number, who take common ground with Romanists in excluding from the pale of communion in the 'holy, catholic, and apostolic church,' all who dissent from their doctrine of 'exclusive apostolic succession.' These assumptions are not only found in many of the old and standard divines of the Church of England, but have been of late zealously put forth in the Oxford 'Tracts for the Times,' have been avowed by English and American bishops, and by a great number of the Episcopal clergy of both countries; and the assurance with which they are urged in many recent publications, calls for a patient and thorough examination of the arguments advanced in their support. Such is the work undertaken by our author. The topics of the twenty-one Lectures comprised in this volume, are as follows, etc. These subjects are discussed with great earnestness and strength; and the ample and numerous authorities by which his statements and reasonings are confirmed, show that the author has spared no labor, and dispensed with no available aid, in his investigations. As far as we have examined them, they appear to us thorough and satisfactory, and we cordially commend the work to the diligent study of our readers.'

From the Rev. Samuel H. Cox, D. D. Extract from a Letter.

'REV. AND DEAR SIR:—Though personally unknown to you, yet have I been so pleased with your Lectures on the Apostolical Succession, that I thought it but fair to tell you of it. . . . I believe you are doing a protestant and a christian work; and while I regret some incidental differences of another kind between us, I am happy to assure you of my God-speed, and of my prayers for a blessing on your labors.'

From the Rev. Dr. Lamson.

Dr. Lamson in his *Lecture on the Uses of Ecclesiastical History*, (Christian Examiner, Sept. 1842, p. 12,) in alluding to the claims of prelacy, and the doctrine of Apostolical Succession, says: 'It has been found necessary to take the field, and already a goodly sized octavo, manifesting no little industry and research, has appeared, printed in this city, though written by a Presbyterian of the South, in refutation of these, as we are accustomed to consider, perfectly absurd and obsolete claims.'

From the Protestant and Herald.

After speaking of the author's *Ecclesiastical Catechism*, a writer in this paper says: 'He had before prepared us for such a treat, by favoring the *Protestant Church* with a profound, learned, and eloquent argument on 'the Apostolic Succession,' utterly refuting the exclusive and inflated claims of all High Churchmen, or '*china men*,' as they have been appropriately styled in the *Biblical Repository*.

Of this production of his, I have the means of knowing, that *the venerable champion in the cause*, has privately declared 'that Mr. Smyth has quoted books in the controversy, which he had never had the privilege of seeing, and which were even rare in Europe.'

From the Honorable Mitchell King, of Charleston, S. C.

'REV. AND DEAR SIR:— You have done a lasting service to the Presbyterian Church, by the publication of your work on the Prelatical Doctrine of the Apostolical Succession. The question which you there discuss has assumed in our times a renewed importance, from the efforts recently made to claim for particular bodies of Christians an exclusive right to the benefits of that covenant of grace, which Christ came to make with all true believers. This question was, as you and I believe, long ago settled by the thorough investigations and conclusive arguments of men worthy, if mortal men can be worthy, of the great cause in which they were engaged; who were influenced solely by the love of truth, and followed that, wherever it might lead them, without regard to merely human authority; and many of whom sealed their testimony with their blood. These times have passed away. But earnest endeavors have been lately made, to shake the confidence of many Christians in the principles of their fathers, and to overthrow their faith in that Church which we believe to be founded on the words of everlasting life. Your work, therefore, I consider as most seasonable and valuable, as reviving and spreading the knowledge of the fundamental truths on which our Church rests. It contains a fuller review of the reasonings and authorities on this subject, than any other work with which I am acquainted, and will, I am persuaded, henceforth be an armory in which the defenders of Presbyterianism can find weapons of proof ready prepared for them. That you may go forward in the course which you have so honorably begun, and that the Great Head of the Church may follow your labors with his rich blessing, is the earnest prayer of, Rev'd and Dear Sir, yours very truly, M. KING.

From the Rev. John Bachman, D. D., of the German Lutheran Church, Charleston, S. C.

'MY DEAR SIR:— To my mind your Lectures on the Apostolical Succession covers the whole ground, and is, without exception, the most triumphant vindication of our views on this subject, that I have ever read. I regard the work as the most valuable contribution that has ever been made to the Southern Church.'

AN
ECCLESIASTICAL CATECHISM
OF THE
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

For the use of Bible Classes, Families, and Private Members.

THIRD EDITION, MUCH IMPROVED.

This work has been submitted to the revision of the REV. SAMUEL MILLER, D. D. and many others, and is now published, as approved by them, and with their emendations.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Overture adopted by the Synod of S. Carolina and Geo. at its session in 1841.

That the publication of works intended to advocate the distinctive order and polity of our Church should be encouraged, and their circulation among our people rendered as general as possible; and it having come to the knowledge of this Synod, that one of their number, the Rev. Thomas Smyth, of Charleston, has recently given to the Church, among other valuable publications, 'An Ecclesiastical Catechism of the Presbyterian Church, for the use of Families, Bible Classes, and Private Members,'—and a series of Lectures on 'The Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession Examined, and the Protestant Ministry Defended against the Assumptions of Popery and High Churchism.' Therefore, *Resolved*, That the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia regard with pleasure and approbation these publications, as containing an able defence of the divine authority of the Protestant Ministry, and a full and satisfactory exposition of the order and government of our Church; and as demanded by the present state of the controversy on these subjects. And the Synod does, therefore, cordially recommend the said publications to all our Ministers, Elders, and private members, as works of high value, and calculated to advance the intelligence of our Church, on our distinctive peculiarities and doctrines.

From the Biblical Repertory, for January, 1841.

'Mr. Smyth must be regarded as among the most efficient and active authors in the Presbyterian Church. His valuable work on the 'Apostolical Succession,' reviewed in a preceding part of this number, is a monument of his reading and industry, which has been extensively acknowledged. The 'Ecclesiastical Catechism' before us, is another present to the Church with which Mr. Smyth is connected, which we think adapted to be universally esteemed, and highly useful. It is, as all such manuals ought to be, brief, comprehensive, simple, adapted to weak capacities, and yet sufficiently instructive to gratify the most intelligent minds. The Scriptural quotations to illustrate and establish the principles he lays down, are perhaps, in some cases, unnecessarily numerous, and in a few instances, of questionable application. But it is on the whole so well executed, and possesses so much solid merit, that we hope it may be extensively circulated and used.'

From the Rev. Geo. Howe, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia.

'The design and the execution are excellent. It contains a more complete explanation of the order and government of our Church, than I have ever before seen in so small a compass. I think it admirably adapted to the purposes for which it was designed, and could wish to see it in every Presbyterian family, and studied by all our young people, as an appendix to the doctrinal catechisms.'

From The Presbyterian.

'We have received a neat and well-printed little volume of one hundred and twenty-four pages, entitled 'An Ecclesiastical Catechism of the Presbyterian Church, for the use of Families, Bible Classes, and Private Members:' by Rev. Thomas Smyth, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Charleston, S. C., into which the author has compressed a large amount of very valuable matter, explanatory and illustrative of Church order, and which we regard as particularly serviceable at the present time, as supplying a desideratum in the education of Presbyterian youth. Although the author modestly remarks, that his Catechism is an *attempt* rather than an actual *accomplishment* of all that he believes to be demanded by the necessities of the Church, yet from the attention we have been able to bestow on it, we should regard the execution of the attempt as highly creditable, and we believe the book to be deserving of an immediate adoption in the instruction of the youth of our Church.'

From the Christian Intelligencer, of the Reformed Dutch Church, N. Y.

'The members of the Presbyterian Church should possess a full and satisfactory acquaintance with the principles of Presbyterian government, polity, and worship. This little volume is exceedingly well adapted to aid in gaining this acquaintance, and is suited for general and popular use. While industrious efforts are employed by other denominations in opposition to these principles, it is highly important and desirable that a popular manual, in elucidation and vindication of their creeds, as is provided in this volume, should be circulated. The following are the subjects of the chapters, each of which contains several sections, or subdivisions — I. The Church. II. Governments of the Church. III. Officers of the Church. IV. Courts of the Church. V. Power of the Church. VI. Fellowship of the Church. VII. Relation of the Presbyterian Church to other denominations. The catechetical form of the work, and the copious scripture-references and authorities, adapt it to the use of instruction. Such a volume as this was needed; and we feel indebted to Mr. Smyth for the preparation of it, as we deem it, in matter and manner, meeting the desideratum required.'

From the Charleston Observer.

'Of the first edition of this work we spoke in terms of commendation. But this is a very considerable improvement, not only in the style in which it is gotten up — for it is very neatly printed and bound — but in the arrangement and matter. It supplies a place that is needed, and yet it is issued merely as an *attempt* to furnish the Church with a brief compend of her worship and polity. As a denomination, we have been remiss in the duty of letting the principles and polity of our Church be generally known. Many of our own members need information on this subject, that they may be established in the truth and order of the house of God. And information is needed also by others, to correct the erroneous impressions respecting it, which have been designedly or undesignedly made upon their minds. The work deserves general circulation.'

From the New York Observer.

'The preparation of this little work was the result of a suggestion by Rev. Dr. Miller, of Princeton; and in it the author has presented the peculiar features of the form of Government in the Presbyterian Church, in questions and answers, and in simple language, that the sentiments inculcated may be readily learned and remembered by the young.'

From the Protestant and Herald.

'MR. EDITOR:—During the past winter, the Female Bible Class of my pastoral charge, have memorized *'The Ecclesiastical Catechism,'* prepared by the Rev. Thomas Smyth, of Charleston, South Carolina. I make this statement in your columns, in order to excite and secure the attention of your readers to the utility and value of that little volume. The ladies have manifested an unusual degree of delight and enthusiasm in their recitations. The result has been, if I mistake not, 'a full and comprehensive acquaintance with the principles of the worship and polity of our Church.' Such was the hope of its worthy and able author in the preparation of his book. The proof-texts are generally printed at length in the Catechism. Without attempting an analysis of this book, allow me to urge Pastors, and Ruling Elders, and Deacons, and Sunday School Teachers in our Churches, to procure this interesting and attractive and cheap compend of Church order, and indoctrinate their families and pupils into these cherished principles of our denomination. Are we not, as a body of people, quite remiss in this high duty? Let the standard-bearers in our host, testir themselves as they ought, to circulate this work, as a Presbyterian Sabbath School book, and make it, if you please, what it deserves to be, next to our Larger and Shorter Catechism—a *Presbyterian classic* in all our family instructions.'

From the Magnolia, a Literary Magazine and Monthly Review.

'This little volume was meant for, and is acknowledged to have supplied a want, among the members of the Presbyterian Church. It is a copious compilation, containing a large amount of religious information, and we take for granted, that, among the class of Christians for whose use it was prepared, it is far superior to any thing of the sort which had ever been offered them before. It shows industry, reading, and analysis.'

From the American Biblical Repository.

'This little volume is issued by the same publishers as the preceding work, by the same author. It is a well-digested system of questions and answers on the Church, its government,—its officers,—its courts,—its powers,—its fellowship, and the relation of the Presbyterian Church to other denominations. It is a useful manual for Presbyterians, and may be instructive to others.'

ALSO, BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

SOLACE FOR BEREAVED PARENTS; OR, INFANTS DIE TO LIVE.

With a Historical Account of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation.

'The doctrine of the Salvation of Infants is ably defended in this little volume, and the sweet consolation of this belief is tendered to parents whom God has bereaved. Enemies of Calvinism have delighted to misrepresent its friends on this point, and to them we commend the book; as well as to those who love, with Jesus, to say of little children, 'of such is the Kingdom.'—*New York Observer.*

A FORM FOR THE SOLEMNIZATION OF MARRIAGE

ACCORDING TO THE ORDER OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

TRACTS ON PRESBYTERIANISM. 1 Vol. 12mo.

ALSO, BY THE SAME AUTHOR,
JUST PUBLISHED,
PRESBYTERY AND NOT PRELACY
THE SCRIPTURAL AND PRIMITIVE POLITY,
PROVED FROM THE TESTIMONIES OF SCRIPTURE; THE FATHERS; THE SCHOOL-
MEN; THE REFORMERS; AND THE ENGLISH AND ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

ALSO, THE ANTIQUITY OF PRESBYTERY;
INCLUDING AN ACCOUNT OF THE ANCIENT CULDEES, AND OF ST. PATRICK.

ECCLESIASTICAL REPUBLICANISM;
OR THE REPUBLICANISM, LIBERALITY, AND CATHOLICITY OF
PRESBYTERY,
IN CONTRAST WITH PRELACY AND POPERY.

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION,
AN ABRIDGED EDITION OF THE AUTHOR'S WORK ON
THE PRELITICAL DOCTRINE
OF THE
APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION,
PREPARED, AT HIS REQUEST, BY THE
REV. JOSEPH TRACY,
AUTHOR OF THE GREAT AWAKENING, HISTORY OF THE A. B. C.
FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS, &c.

1 1012 01185 4306

JUN 13 1972			
GAYLORD			PRINTED IN U S A

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U S A

